This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

WHHS


MODERN ELOQUENCE
LIBRARY OF
POLITICAL ORATORY
WAC





HENRY CLAY

Photogravure after a daguerreotype by Brady

MODERN ELOQUENCE

EDITOR-

THOMAS B. REED

JUSTIN McCARTHY · ROSSITER JOHNSON
ALBERT ELLERY BERGH

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

VOL. XII

POLITICAL ORATORY

BUT—DEM

JOHN D. MORRIS AND COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA

W. A. COWIE 1901

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
96262
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1903 L

Copyright, 1903
By
JOHN D MORRIS AND COMPANY

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION

EDWARD EVERETT HALE, Author of "The Man Without a Country."

JOHN B. GORDON, Former United States Senator.

NATHAN HASKELL DOLE, Associate Editor "International Library of Famous Literature."

JAMES B. POND, Manager Lecture Bureau; Author of "Eccentricities of Genius."

GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER, Professor of English Literature, Princeton University.

LORENZO SEARS, Professor of English Literature, Brown University.

EDWIN M. BACON, Former Editor "Boston Advertiser" and "Boston Post."

J. WALKER MCSPADDEN, Managing Editor "Édition Royale" of Balzac's Works.

F. CUNLIFFE OWEN, Member Editorial Staff "New York Tribune."

TRUMAN A. DEWEESE, Member Editorial Staff "Chicago Times-Herald."

CHAMP CLARK, Member of Congress from Missouri.

MARCUS BENJAMIN, Editor, National Museum, Washington, D. C.

CLARK HOWELL, Editor "Atlanta Constitution."

EPIPHANIUS WILSON, Managing Editor.

INTRODUCTIONS AND SPECIAL ARTICLES BY

THOMAS B. REED,	HAMILTON WRIGHT MABIE,
LORENZO SEARS,	JONATHAN P. DOLLIVER,
CHAMP CLARK,	EDWARD EVERETT HALE,
GEORGE F. HOAR,	CHARLES W. EMERSON,
ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE,	ALBERT ELLERY BERGH.

NOTE.—A large number of the most distinguished speakers of this country and Great Britain have selected their own best speeches for this Library. These speakers include Whitelaw Reid, William Jennings Bryan, Henry van Dyke, Henry M. Stanley, Newell Dwight Hillis, Joseph Jefferson, Sir Henry Irving, Arthur T. Hadley, John D. Long, David Starr Jordan, and many others of equal note.

PUBLIC SPEAKING

"AND the common people heard Him gladly," for "He taught them as one having authority." These sentences reveal the very heart of effective speaking. Considered from the human view-point alone, the Son of Mary was the prince of speakers. He alone has delivered a perfect address—the Sermon on the Mount. The two other speeches that approach it are Paul's appeal to the Athenians on Mars Hill and the speech of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg. These have no tricks, no devices, no tinsel gilt. They do not attempt to "split the ears of the groundlings," and yet they are addressed to the commonest of the world's common people.

Imagination, reason, and that peculiar human quality in speech which defies analysis as much as the perfume of the rose, but which touches the heart and reaches the mind, are blended in each of these utterances in perfect proportion. But, above all, each of these model speeches which the world has thus far produced teaches. They instruct. And, in doing this, they assert. The men who spoke them did not weaken them by suggesting a doubt of what they had to say. This is common to all great speeches.

Not one immortal utterance can be produced which contains such expressions as "I may be wrong," or, "In my humble opinion," or, "In my judgment." The great speakers, in their highest moments, have always been so charged with aggressive conviction that they announced their conclusions as ultimate truths. They speak "as one having authority," and, therefore, "the common people hear them gladly."

All of this means that the two indispensable requisites of speaking are, first, to have something to say, and, sec-

ond, to say it as though you mean it. Of course, one cannot have something really to say—a lesson to teach, a message to deliver—every fifteen minutes. Very well, then; until one does have something to say, let one hold one's peace.

Carlyle's idea is correct. He thought that no man has a right to speak until what he has to say is so ripe with meaning, and the season for his saying it is so compelling, that what he says will result in a deed—a thing accomplished—now or after a while. In the prophetic old Scotchman's iron philosophy there was no room for anything but deeds. If such instruction is needed; if a great movement requires the forming and constructive word to interpret it and give it direction; if a movement in a wrong direction needs halting and turning to its proper course; if a cause needs leading; if a law needs interpretation; if anything really needs to be said—the occasion for the orator, in the large sense of that word, has arrived. And, when he speaks, "the common people will hear him gladly"; they will hear him because he teaches, and does it "as one having authority."

Whenever a speaker fails to make his audience forget voice, gesture, and even the speaker himself, whenever he fails to make the listeners conscious only of the living truth he utters, he has failed in his speech itself, which, then, has no other reason for having been delivered than a play or any other form of entertainment.

As a matter of fact, very few of the great orators have had loud voices, or if they did have them, they did not employ them. I am told that Wendell Phillips seldom spoke in any voice but a conversational tone, and yet he was able to make an audience of many thousands hear distinctly. It is probable that no man ever lived who had a more sensuous effect upon his hearers than Ingersoll. In a literal and physical sense he charmed them. I never heard him talk in a loud voice. There was no "bell-like" quality. It was not an "organ-like" voice.

The greatest feat of modern speech, in its immediate effect, was Henry Ward Beecher's speech to the Liverpool mob. A gentleman who heard that speech told me that, notwithstanding the pandemonium that reigned around him, Beecher did not shout, or speak at the top of his voice,

a single time during that terrible four hours. It is true that Æschines spoke of Demosthenes' delivery of his Oration on the Crown as having the ferocity of a wild beast. I do not see how that can be, however, because Demosthenes selected Isæus as his teacher because Isæus was "business-like" in method.

This, however, is common to the voices of nearly all great speakers: they have a peculiar power of penetration that carries them much farther than the shout and halloo of the loudest-voiced person. They have, too, a singularly touching and tender quality, which, in a sensuous way, captivates and holds the hearers. James Whitcomb Riley has this quality in his voice when reciting. Julia Marlowe has it. Olga Nethersole has it to the very highest degree. Madame Modjeska has it nearly as much.

It is a remarkable thing that there is neither wit nor humor in any of the immortal speeches that have fallen from the lips of man. To find a joke in Webster would be an offense. The only things which Ingersoll wrote that will live are his oration at his brother's grave and his famous "The Past Rises Before Me Like a Dream." But in neither of these productions of this genius of jesters is there a single trace of wit. There is not a funny sally in all Burke's speeches. Lincoln's Gettysburg address, his first and second inaugurals, his speech beginning the Douglas campaign, and his Cooper Union address in New York are, perhaps, the only utterances of his that will endure. Yet this greatest of story-tellers since Æsop did not adorn or deface one of these great deliverances with story or any form of humor.

The reason for this is found in the whole tendency of human thought and feeling—in the whole melancholy history of the race—where tears and grief, the hard seriousness of life and the terrible and speedy certainty of our common fate of suffering and of death, make somber the master-cord of existence. The immortal things are all serious—even sad. It is so with speech—I mean the speech that affects the convictions and understandings of men. I am excluding now that form of speech which is merely a species of entertainment. It belongs to the same class, though of a higher order, as the theatrical exhibition.

Where there is an earnestness of thought (and earnestness is only another name for seriousness) there will always be the same quality in manner—an impressiveness in bearing and delivery. This is inconsistent with merriment of delivery, which robs speech of a certain weight and intrinsic worth. It is also inconsistent with the voice of storm and the hurricane manner. And men in deadly earnest do not talk loud. It has been my fortune to see men angry and aroused to the point of killing; they were intense, but quiet. I have also seen that bravado and drunken boisterousness which thought it imitated, and meant to imitate, genuine rage; it is always strident and violent, never dangerous, never sincere. The same thing is true in speech. There have only been two or three roarers in effective oratory—Mirabeau, by all accounts; and Demosthenes, if Æschines is to be believed, which I think he is not to be in this particular. He was only excusing his own defeat, and he had to attribute it to delivery (I think any unprejudiced mind will agree that Æschines made far the better argument). All the other great speakers have, even in their most intense passages and in situations where life and death were involved, been comparatively quiet.

I remember, as if it were yesterday, the first great speaker I ever heard. It was Robert G. Ingersoll delivering a lecture in Des Moines, Iowa, in 1884. He had an audience which would have inspired eloquence in almost any breast. He came on the stage alone, and was very carefully and elegantly attired, even to the smallest item of his grooming. His address was in manuscript, and imperfectly committed to memory. He laid it down on a little table at the back of the stage (returning to it occasionally to refresh his memory), and then, in a very natural and matter-of-fact way, walked to the footlights and, looking the audience frankly in the eyes, began without an instant's hesitation and in a voice precisely as if he were talking to a friend.

But he was as dramatic at his climax as Edwin Booth ever was in "Hamlet." His face paled, or seemed to pale; his hands clenched with a desperate energy, and the whole attitude of the man was that of one in awful wrath; and yet his voice was not raised above the common current of the evening's address—if anything, it was lower. While

the mature mind cannot endure Ingersoll's rhetoric, it must be acknowledged that his manner of delivery (except when his levity made him coarse) was nearly equal to that of Wendell Phillips. Both of these men had that instinctive taste of the great speaker which Shakespeare has described better than any one else in literature, when he makes Hamlet tell the players not to "mouth it, as many of your players do. I had as lief the town-crier spoke my lines. Nor do not saw the air too much with your hand, thus; but use all gently: for in the very torrent, tempest, and (as I may say) whirlwind of passion, you must acquire and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness. Oh! it offends me to the soul to hear a robustious, periwig-pated fellow tear a passion to tatters, to very rags, to split the ears of the groundlings; who, for the most part, are capable of nothing but inexplicable dumb shows and noise: I would have such a fellow whipped for o'erdoing Termagant; it out-herods Herod: pray you avoid it."

When I was a very young boy I saw a fist-fight which impressed me as powerfully as any lesson I ever learned at school. An over-tall and powerful man about forty years old had become very angry at a medium-sized but very compact man of about the same age. As his passion increased his violence grew until, finally, he was shouting his denunciations. The little man stood quietly and also stood pat. Finally, with a great volume of sound, the big man rushed upon the little one with arms swinging in the air, and I looked with interest and curiosity to see the smaller man either run or be demolished. He did neither. His fists were raised, quickly but intensely, before him, and, when the big man was almost upon him, it seemed to me that his right hand did not shoot out farther than ten or twelve inches—but it did shoot out, and the result was as if the big man had been shot sure enough. He fell like a slaughtered ox, but rose and came on again, only again to be knocked out. This continued for three or four times, for the giant was game, but, finally, he was "thrashed to a standstill," as the expression has it.

It was a great lesson in life, and a great lesson in speaking, which is only a phase of life. The victor came to the point. He did not dissipate his energies. It is so in the

manner of speaking. The greatest contrast to the perfect method of Ingersoll which I ever beheld in a man of equal eminence was in the delivery of a lecture by Joseph Cook.

He came on the stage with ostentatious impressiveness. He sat some time before he was introduced. After introduction he stood with one hand thrust in the breast of his tightly buttoned frock-coat, and looked tremendously all over the audience for, perhaps, an entire minute. Everybody was awed. He looked so great. We all said to ourselves, "What a mighty man this is!" And, when that effect had been produced upon us, the first and great point of effectiveness had been destroyed—the speaker had made us think about himself, his manner, his appearance, his personality. All the evening we had to wade through that slough, trying to follow his thought. And this reminds me of a saying of Charles G. Dawes, one of the most astute politicians and most capable public men of recent development, which is:—

"The surest sign that a man is not great is that he strives to look great."

I think the best speech I ever heard for obedience to the rules of the art was an address of about ten minutes by a young Salvation Army officer on the streets of Chicago. I listened with amazement. He was, perhaps, twenty-three years of age, with delicate, clear-cut features, sensitive mouth, and marvelously intelligent eyes. I was just passing the group as he stepped into the circle that always surrounds these noisy but sincere enthusiasts. He took off his hat, and in a very low, perfectly natural and very sweet voice, speaking exactly as though he were having a conversation with his most confidential friend, he began: "You will admit, my friends, that human happiness is the problem of human life." And from this striking sentence he went on to another equally moving, showing, of course, that happiness could not be secured by traveling any of the usual roads, but only the straight and narrow path which the Master had marked out. It was as simple as it was sincere. And it was as conversational as it was quiet. Before he had finished his audience had gathered into itself every pedestrian who passed during his discourse—business man, professional man, working-man, or what not.

The fight above described suggests the key to the matter, as well as the manner, of speaking. The American audience properly demands, above everything else, that the speaker get to the point. Our lives are so rapid; the telephone, telegraph, and all the instantaneous agencies of our neurotically rapid civilization have made us so quick in seeing through propositions; a hundred years of universal education have produced a mentality so electric in its rapidity that effective oratory has been revolutionized within a decade.

Burke would not be tolerated now. It is doubtful, even, if Webster would. The public had already tired of the lilt of Ingersoll's redundant rhetoric, pleasing as was its music. Speech must now be a statement of conclusions. The listeners, with a celerity inconceivable, sum up the argument on either side of the proposition you announce, and accept or reject it by an almost unconscious process of cerebration.

The most successful speech of to-day would be one of Emerson's essays, rearranged in logical order—if such a thing were possible. Therefore, in matter, the statement is the form of address most effective to-day. Senator McDonald, the greatest natural lawyer I ever knew, told me that the best argument in a case was always the statement of the case. This is true on the face of it, of course. In form, the sentences should be short; in language, the words should be as largely as possible Anglo-Saxon. These are the words of the people you address; therefore, they are most influential with them. Also, therefore, your best method of getting Anglo-Saxon is to mingle with and talk with the common people. Also, therefore, the next best method is to read the Bible, the King James translation of which is undoubtedly the purest fountain of English that flows in all the world of our literature.

What nonsense the repeated statement that public speaking has had its day, that the newspaper has taken its place, and all the rest of that kind of talk. Public speaking will never decline until men cease to have ears to hear. How hard it is to read a speech—how delightful to listen. Speaking is nature's method of instruction. It begins with the mother to child; it continues with teacher to pupil; it continues still in lecturer or professor to his student (for the

universities are all going back to the old oral method of instruction); and it still continues in all the forms of effective human communication.

The newspapers are a marvelous influence, but they are not everything and they do not supply everything. For example, it is commonly supposed that they absolutely and exclusively mould and control public opinion. But they do not. When all has been said, the most powerful public opinion, after all, is that from mouth-to-mouth public opinion—that living, moving opinion which spreads from neighbor to neighbor, and has fused into it the vitality of the personality of nearly every man—yes, and woman; don't forget that—in the whole community.

And the philosophy which underlies this is what makes public speaking immortal. The Master understood this very well, and that is why He chose to speak by word of mouth rather than by writing epistles. The Saviour never wrote a single epistle—no, not even a single word. He spoke His message. Think of a gospel announced to the world in cold type! Absurd, is it not? It may be repeated in that form; but its initial power must come from the spoken word and vital personality of its author. But it was not "extemporaneous." All His life He had been preparing His few sermons—lessons.

The great speakers to whom I have listened have confirmed certain conclusions upon the subject of speaking at which I arrived while in college. It seemed to me that the college method of speaking was wrong, because it was irrational—that the studied gestures, the "cultivated" voice, the staccato impressiveness, were all artificial devices to attract the attention of an audience to these things instead of to the thought of the address.

Analysis of the problem convinced me that an audience is only a larger person—a great collective individuality—and, therefore, that whatever, in manner or matter, will please, persuade, and convince a person, will have the same effect upon an audience. Hence, one readily deduces that a simple, quiet, and direct address, a straightforward, unartificial, honest manner, without tricks of oratory, is the most effective method of lodging truth in the minds of one's hearers.

Any affectation, any mannerism, detracts from the thought, because it calls the attention of the listener to the mannerism or affectation, when his whole attention should be monopolized by the thought. Read Herbert Spencer on the "Philosophy of Style," and apply his reasoning to the delivery of an address, and you have the rationale of the art of speaking, as well as of speech, put with that wonderful thinker's unerringness.

The method commonly employed in preparing speeches is incorrect. That method is to read all the books one can get on the subject, take all the opinions that can be procured, make exhaustive notes, and then write the speech. Such a speech is nothing but a compilation. It is merely an arrangement of second-hand thought and observation, and of other people's ideas. It never has the power of living and original thinking.

The true way is to take the elements of the problem in hand, and, without consulting a book or an opinion, reason out from the very elements of the problem itself your solution of it, and then prepare your speech.

After this, read, read, read, comprehensively, omnivorously, in order to see whether your original solution was not exploded a hundred years ago—aye, or a thousand; and also, to fortify and make accurate your own thought. Read Matthew Arnold on "Literature and Dogma," and you will discover why it is necessary for you to read exhaustively on any subject about which you would think or write or speak. But, as you value your independence of mind—yes, even your vigor of mind—do not read other men's opinions upon the subject *before* you have clearly thought out your own conclusions from the premises of the elemental facts.

And as to style, seek only to be clear. Nothing else is important.

Consider the method of the Saviour in His addresses to the people. Next to Him, those perfect specimens of the art of putting things are the speeches and epistles of St. Paul. I know of nothing in literature so clear, convincing, and logical. The words of the Master astonish one with their absolute unity with all the rules of effective address. Especially His method of driving home a truth by repeating

it, and that, too, in exactly the same words, is noticeable and very effective. He did not fear that He would be tiresome; He was concerned only in being clear. Take the following examples:—

Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock.

And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.

And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand.

And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.—Matthew vii: 24–27.

Or study this:—

And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.—Matthew v: 29, 30.

Or this:—

Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in.

Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink?

When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee?

Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink:

I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.

Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?

Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.—Matthew xxv: 34–45.

Consider Antony's funeral oration over the dead body of Cæsar, and note the same mastery of the art of repetition.

But, like all powerful weapons, it is dangerous to one who is not a natural speaker. It might easily be fatal, for remember that we are advised to "use not vain repetition as the heathen do, for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking."

I doubt if any man can be a great speaker who does not have in him the religious element. I do not mean that he shall be good (one may be good and not religious, or the reverse, as any professor of mental and moral philosophy will tell you); but that he shall have in him that mysticism, that elemental and instinctive conviction of the higher power and its providence which makes him in sympathy with the great mass of humanity. Emerson has pointed out that the great speaker—yes, and the great man—is he who best interprets the common feeling and tendency of the masses.

The profoundest feeling among the masses, the most influential element in their character, is the religious element. It is as instinctive and elemental as the law of self-preservation. It informs the whole intellect and personality of the people. And he who would greatly influence the people by uttering their unformed thought must have this great invisible and unanalyzable bond of sympathy with them. I will let your preacher work this out more elaborately for you.

One word more; and to this word listen and hearken and bind it on the tablets of your understanding. *Insincerity cuts the heart out of all oratory.* You may marshal

your arguments and concoct your pretty devices of words and work yourself into a great heat in the speaking of them; but if you do not believe what you say you are only a play-actor after all—a poor mummer reciting your own lines. You had far better be a professional actor—that will, at least, insure you excellent lines to declaim.

To effect anything; to achieve a result; to make your words deeds, as the old Scotch thinker declared they should be or else not be uttered, you must *teach*. And in your teaching you must teach "as one having authority." To the Master we must go, after all, even for our methods of utterance; and at His feet learn that oratory is the utterance of the truth by one who knows it to be the truth. And so will your words be words of fire and your speech have weight among your fellow men.

CONTENTS

VOLUME XII

BUTLER, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN — PAGE

Character and Results of the War. (*Delivered in New York City, April 2, 1863*) . . . 445

CALHOUN, JOHN CALDWELL

Last Speech: Slavery. (*In the United States Senate, March 4, 1850*) 457

Nullification and the Force Bill. (*In the United States Senate, Feb. 15, 1833*) 485

CANNING, GEORGE

The Fall of Bonaparte. (*Delivered in Liverpool, Jan. 10, 1814*) 494

CARNOT, LAZARE NICOLAS MARGUERITE

Against Imperialism in France. (*In the National Assembly, 1812*) 510

CASTELAR, EMILIO

A Plea for Republican Institutions. (*In the Cortes, Dec. 18, 1869*) 517

The Abolition of Slavery. (*In the Cortes, June 20, 1870*) 523

CAVOUR, COUNT CAMILLO BENSO DI

Rome and Italy. (*Delivered in 1861*) . . . 530

CHAMBERLAIN, JOSEPH

The True Conception of Empire. (*Delivered in London, March 31, 1897*) 536

Splendid Isolation. (*Delivered in London, Jan. 21, 1896*) 541

PAGE

CHASE, SALMON PORTLAND
The Kansas-Nebraska Bill. (*In the United States Senate, April 13, 1854*) 547

CHATHAM, LORD
The Right of Taxing America. (*In the House of Lords, Jan. 14, 1766*) 563

CHOATE, RUFUS
The Preservation of the Union. (*In Faneuil Hall, Boston, Nov. 26, 1850*) 575

CHURCHILL, LORD RANDOLPH
The Desertion of Gordon. (*Delivered in London, Feb. 16, 1884*) 592

CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS
The Fourth Philippic. (*At Rome, B.C. 44*) . . 598
On the Agrarian Law. (*At Rome, B.C. 64*) . . 604

CLARK, CHAMP
On the Annexation of Hawaii. (*In the House of Representatives, June 11, 1898*) . . . 615

CLAY, HENRY
Dictators in American Politics. (*In the United States Senate, April 30, 1834*) 632
The American System. (*In the United States Senate, 1832*) 642
On the Compromise of 1850. (*In the United States Senate, July 22, 1850*) 663
On the Seminole War. (*In the House of Representatives, Jan. 19, 1819*) 672
The Emancipation of South America. (*In the House of Representatives, March 24, 1818*) . . 676

CLEVELAND, GROVER
On Tariff Revision. (*The Presidential Message of 1887*) 687

COBDEN, RICHARD
Free Trade with All Nations. (*Delivered in Manchester, Jan. 15, 1846*) 698

COCKRAN, WILLIAM BOURKE PAGE
Answer to William Jennings Bryan. (*In Madison Square Garden, New York, Aug. 18, 1896*) . 710

CONKLING, ROSCOE
Nominating General Grant for a Third Term. (*At the National Convention, Chicago, June, 1880*) . 719

CORWIN, THOMAS
Against War with Mexico. (*Delivered in the United States Senate, Feb. 11, 1847*) 724

COUSINS, ROBERT G.
On the "Maine" Disaster. (*In the House of Representatives, March 31, 1898*) 738

CROMWELL, OLIVER
On the Dissolution of Parliament. (*Delivered in Parliament, 1658*) 741

CURRAN, JOHN PHILPOT
In Behalf of Rowan. (*In the Court of King's Bench, Dublin, Jan. 29, 1774*) 764
Farewell to the Irish Parliament. (*Delivered May 15, 1797*) 769
On Government by Attachment. (*In the Irish Parliament, Feb. 4, 1785*) 774

CURTIS, GEORGE WILLIAM
His Sovereignty Under His Hat. (*In the National Convention at Chicago, June 4, 1884*) . . 780
On the Spoils System. (*Delivered before the American Social Science Association, Sept. 8, 1881*) . 782

DANTON, GEORGES JACQUES
"To Dare Again, Ever to Dare." (*In the National Assembly, Sept. 2, 1792*) 799
"Let France be Free." (*In the National Assembly, March 10, 1793*) 800
"Squeezing the Sponge." (*At the Convention, April 27, 1793*) 802

DAVIS, CUSHMAN KELLOGG PAGE

The United States in Hawaii. (*In the United States Senate, Jan. 11, 1892*) 804

DAVIS, JEFFERSON

On Withdrawal from the Union. (*In the United States Senate, Jan. 11, 1861*) 815

DEMOSTHENES

The Oration on the Crown. (*Delivered in Athens, B.C. 330*) 821

ILLUSTRATIONS

VOLUME XII

FACING PAGE

HENRY CLAY . . . . . *Frontispiece*
Photogravure after a daguerreotype by Brady

JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN 472
Photogravure after an engraving

SALMON PORTLAND CHASE 554
Photogravure after an etching

ROSCOE CONKLING 720
Photogravure after a photograph from life

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 736
Photogravure after a photograph

OLIVER CROMWELL 760
Photogravure after an engraving

GEORGES JACQUES DANTON 800
Photogravure after an engraving

JEFFERSON DAVIS 818
Photogravure after an engraving by Sartain

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN BUTLER

CHARACTER AND RESULTS OF THE WAR

[Benjamin Franklin Butler, an American military leader and public man, whose speeches were long widely quoted throughout the United States, was born in New Hampshire in 1818. He received an academic education, practiced law in Massachusetts, entered politics as a Democrat, and when the Civil War broke out espoused the cause of the Union warmly. Going to the front he received steady promotion throughout the period of hostilities, his most conspicuous service being at New Orleans. After the war he became a member of Congress and governor of Massachusetts, and in 1884 he was a candidate for the Presidency of the United States on the "Greenback" ticket. He died in 1893. General Butler was a notable figure in American politics for many years, being a sagacious lawyer, a brilliant orator, a brave soldier, and a man of quick and decisive action in any great emergency. The ensuing speech was delivered in New York City in 1863, when the Civil War was at its height, and soon after some of his most brilliant military achievements.]

MR. MAYOR: With the profoundest gratitude for the too flattering commendation of my administration of the various trusts committed to me by the government, which, in behalf of your associates, you have been pleased to tender, I ask you to receive my most heartfelt thanks. To the citizens of New York here assembled, graced by the fairest and loveliest, in kind appreciation of my services, supposed to have been rendered to the country, I tender the deepest acknowledgments. I accept it all, not for myself, but for my brave comrades of the Army of the Gulf. I receive it as an earnest of your devotion to the country—an evidence of your loyalty to the Constitution under which you live and under which you hope to die.

And on this occasion, at the risk of being tedious to patient hearers, at the risk even of calling your attention to

what might seem otherwise too elementary, I propose to run down through the history of the contest, to see what it is that agitates the whole country at this day and this hour.

That we are in the midst of a civil commotion all know. But what is the commotion? Is it a riot, is it an insurrection, is it a rebellion, or is it a revolution? And pray, sir, although it may seem still more elementary, what is a riot? A riot, if I understand it, is simply an outburst of the passions of a number of men, for the moment, in breach of the law, by force of numbers to be put down and subdued by the civil authorities; if it goes further, to be dealt with by the military authorities. But you say, sir, why treat us to a definition of a riot upon this occasion? Why, of all things, should you undertake to instruct a New York audience in what a riot is?

To that I answer, because the administration of Mr. Buchanan dealt with this great change of affairs as if it were a riot; because his government officer gave his opinion that in Charleston it was but a riot.

I found a riot in Baltimore. The rioters had burned the bridges; but the riot had hardly risen to the dignity of an insurrection, because the state had not moved as an organized community. A few men were rioting at Baltimore, and as I marched into the state at the head of the United States troops, the question came up, What have I before me? You all remember that I offered then to put down all kinds of insurrections so long as the State of Maryland remained loyal to the United States. Upon the same theory by which I felt myself bound to put down insurrection in Maryland while it remained loyal, whether that insurrection was the work of blacks or whites—by the same loyalty to the Constitution and laws, I felt bound to take such measures that state property should be protected, and even confiscated, in the rebellious State of Virginia. Pardon me, sir, if right here I say I am a little sensitive on this subject.

While I am very much gratified at the kind expression of your regard, whether that expression is justified can be told in a single word. When I left the Department of the Gulf, I sat down and deliberately put in the form of an address to the people of that department the exact acts

I had done while in their department; I said to them, "I have done these things." I have now waited more than three months, and I have yet to hear a denial from that department that the things therein stated were done.

And to that alone, sir, I can point as a justification of your too flattering eulogy, and to that I point forever as my answer to every slander and every calumny. The ladies of New Orleans knew whether they were safe: has any one of them ever said she was not? The men of New Orleans knew whether life and property were safe: has any man ever said they were not? The poor of New Orleans knew whether the money which was taken from the rich rebels was applied to the alleviation of their wants: has any man denied that it was? To that record I point—and it will be the only answer that I shall ever make; and I only do it now because I desire that you shall have neither doubt nor feeling upon this subject—it is the only answer I can ever make to the thousand calumnies that have been poured upon me and mine, and upon the officers who worked with me for the good of our country.

I desire now to say a single word upon the question, What are the prospects of this war? My simple opinion would be no better than that of another man; but let me show you the reason for the faith that is in me that this war is progressing steadily to a successful termination. Compare the state of the country on January 1, 1863, with the state of the country on January 1, 1862, and tell me whether there has not been progress. At that time the Union armies held no considerable portion of Missouri, of Kentucky, or of Tennessee; none of Virginia, except Fortress Monroe and Arlington Heights; none of North Carolina save Hatteras, and none of South Carolina save Port Royal. All the rest was ground of struggle at least, and all the rest furnishing supplies to the rebels.

Now they hold none of Missouri, none of Kentucky, none of Tennessee, for any valuable purpose of supplies, because the western portion is in our hands, and the eastern portion has been so run over by the contending armies that the supplies are gone. They hold no portion of Virginia valuable for supplies, for that is eaten out by their armies. We hold one-third of Virginia and half of North Carolina.

We hold our own in South Carolina, and I hope that before the eleventh of this month we shall hold a little more. We hold two-thirds of Louisiana in wealth and population. We hold all Arkansas and all Texas so far as supplies are concerned, so long as Farragut is between Port Hudson and Vicksburg. And I believe the colored troops held Florida at the last accounts.

Now, then, let us see to what the rebellion is reduced. It is reduced to the remainder of Virginia, part of North and South Carolina, all of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, and a small portion of Louisiana and Tennessee; Texas and Arkansas, as I said before, being cut off. Why I draw strong hopes from this is, that their supplies come either from Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, or Texas, and these are now completely beyond their reach. To this fact I look largely for the suppression of this rebellion and the overthrow of this revolution.

They have got to the end of their conscription; we have not begun ours. They have got to the end of their national credit; we have not put ours in any market in the world. And why should any man be desponding? Why should any man say that this great work has gone on too slowly? Why should men feel impatient? The war of the Revolution was seven years. Why should men be so anxious that nations should march faster than they are prepared to march —faster than the tread of nations has ever been in the providence of God? Nations in war have ever moved slowly. We are too impatient—we never learn anything, it would seem to me, from reading history. I speak of myself as well as you—I have shared in that impatience myself. I have shared in your various matters of disappointment.

I was saying but the other day to a friend of mine, "It seems strange to me that our navy cannot catch that steamer 'Alabama'; there must be something wrong in the navy department, I'm afraid"—and I got quite impatient. I had hardly got over the wound inflicted by the capture of the "Jacob Bell," when came the piracies of the "Golden Eagle," and the "Olive Jane," and as one was from Boston, it touched me keenly.

He replied: "Don't be impatient; remember that Paul Jones, with a sailing-ship on the coast of England, put the

whole British navy at defiance for many months, and wandered up and down that coast, and worked his will upon it, and England had no naval power to contend with, and had not twenty-five hundred miles of seacoast to blockade, as we have."

I remember that in the French war, Lord Cochrane, with one vessel, and that was by no means a steamship, held the whole French coast in terror against the French navy. And so it has been done by other nations. Let us have a little patience, and possess our souls with a little patriotism and less politics, and we shall have no difficulty.

But there is one circumstance of this war, I am bound to say in all frankness to you, that I do not like the appearance of, and that is because we cannot exactly reach it. I refer to the war made upon our commerce, which is not the fault of the navy, nor of any department of the government, but is the fault of our allies. Pardon me a moment, for I am speaking now in the commercial city of New York, where I think it is of interest to you, and of a matter to which I have given some reflection—pardon me a moment while we examine and see what England has done. She agreed to be neutral—I have tried to demonstrate to you that she ought to have been a little more than neutral—but has she been even that? ["No, no, no."] Let us see the evidences of that "No."

In the first place there has been nothing of the Union cause that her orators and her statesmen have not maligned; there has been nothing of sympathy or encouragement which she has not afforded our enemies; there has been nothing which she could do under the cover of neutrality which she has not done to aid them. Nassau has been a naval arsenal for pirate rebel boats to refit in. Kingston has been their coal depot, and Barbadoes has been the dancing hall to fête pirate chieftains in.

What cause, my friends; what cause, my countrymen, has England so to deal with us? What is the reason she does so deal with us? Is it because we have never shown sympathy toward her or love to her people? And mark me here, that I make a distinction between the English people as a mass and the English Government. I think the heart of her people beats responsive to ours—but I know her

government and aristocracy hate us with a hate which passeth all understanding. I say, let us see if we have given any cause for this. I know, I think, what the cause is; but let us see what we have done.

You remember that when the famine overtook the Irish in 1847, the "Macedonian" frigate carried out the bread from this country to feed the poor that England was starving. When afterward the heir to her throne arrived here, aye, in this very house, our people assembled to do him welcome in such numbers that the very floor would not uphold them; and to testify our appreciation of the high qualities of his mother and sovereign, and our love of the English people, we gave him such a reception as Northern gentlemen give to their friends, and his present admirers at Richmond gave him such a reception as Southern gentlemen give to their friends. What further has been done by us? No, I have no right to claim any portion of it. What has been done by the merchants of New York? The "George Griswold" goes out to feed the starving poor of Lancashire, to which yourselves all contributed, and it was only God's blessing on that charity that prevented that vessel being overhauled and burned by the "Alabama," fitted out from an English port.

And to-day, at Birkenhead, the "Sumter" is being fitted out—at Barbadoes the captain of the "Florida" is being fêted—and somewhere the "290," the cabalistic number of the British merchants who contributed to her construction, is preying upon our commerce, while we hear that at Glasgow a steamer is being built for the Emperor of China, and at Liverpool another is about to be launched for the Emperor of China. Pardon me, I don't believe the Emperor of China will buy many ships of Great Britain until they bring back the silk gowns they stole out of his palace at Pekin. And even now, I say that our commerce is being preyed upon by ships in the hands of the rebels built by English builders. And I ask the merchants of the city of New York whether it has not already reached the point where our commerce, to be safe, has to be carried in British bottoms.

Now I learn from the late correspondence of Earl Russell with the rebel commissioner Mason, that the British

have put two articles of the treaty of Paris in compact with the rebels: First, that 'enemies' goods shall be covered by neutral flags, and there shall be free trade at the ports and open trade with neutrals. Why didn't Great Britain put the other part of the treaty in compact; namely, that there should be no more privateering, if she was honest and earnest, and did not mean our commerce should be crippled by rebel piracy?

Again, when we took from her deck our two senators and rebel ambassadors, Slidell and Mason, and took them, in my judgment, according to the laws of nations, what did she do but threaten us with war! I agree that it was wisely done, perhaps, not to provoke war at that time—we were not quite in a condition for it—but I thank God, and that always, that we are fast getting in a condition to remember that threat always and every day! Why is it all this has been done? Because we alone can be the commercial rivals of Great Britain! and because the South has no commercial marine.

There has been, in my judgment, a deliberate attempt on the part of Great Britain, under the plea of neutrality, to allow our commerce to be ruined for her own benefit, if human actions indicate human thoughts. It is idle to tell me Great Britain does not know these vessels are fitted out in her ports. It is idle and insulting to tell me that she put the "Alabama" under $20,000 bonds not to go into the service of the Confederate States. The "Jacob Bell" alone would pay the amount of the bond over and over again.

We did not so deal with her when she was at war with Russia. On the suggestion of the British minister our government stopped, with the rapidity of lightning, the sailing of a steamer supposed to be for Russia, until the minister himself was convinced of her good faith and willing to let her go. We must take some means to put a stop to these piracies and to the fitting out of pirate vessels in English ports. They are always telling us about the inefficiency of a republican government, but as they are acting now, we could stop two pirates to their one. We must in some way put a stop to the construction and fitting out of these pirate vessels in English ports to prey upon our commerce or else consent to keep our ships idle at home. We must stop

them—we must act upon the people of England if we cannot secure a stoppage in any other way.

I have seen it stated that the loss to our commerce already amounts to $9,000,000—enough to have paid the expense of keeping a large number of vessels at home, and out of the way of these cruisers.

What shall we do in the matter? Why, when our government takes a step toward putting a stop to it (and I believe it is taking that step now, but it is not in my province to speak of it) we must aid it in so doing. We, the people, are the government in this matter, and when our government gets ready to take a step we must get ready to sustain it.

England told us what to do when we took Mason and Slidell, and she thought there was a likelihood to be war. She stopped exportation of those articles which she thought we wanted, and which she had allowed to be exported before. Let us do the same thing.

Let us proclaim non-intercourse, so that no ounce of American food shall ever by any accident get into an Englishman's mouth until these piracies cease. [A voice: "Say that again!"] I never say anything, my friends, that I am afraid to say again. I repeat—let us proclaim non-intercourse, so that no ounce of American food shall by any accident get into an Englishman's mouth until these piracies are stopped. That we have a right to do; and when we ever do do it, my word for it, the English Government will find out where these vessels are going to, and they will write to the Emperor of China upon the subject. But I hear some objectors say, "If you proclaim non-intercourse, England may go to war."

Now I am not to be frightened twice running. I got frightened a little better than a year ago, but I have gotten over it. Further, this is a necessity; for we must keep our ships at home in some form to save them from these piracies when a dozen of these privateers get loose upon the seas. It will become a war measure which any nation, under any law, under any construction, would warrant our right to enforce.

And this course should be adopted toward the English nation alone, for I have never heard of any blockade runners under the French flag, nor under the Russian flag, nor under the Austrian flag, nor under the Greek flag. No!

not even the Turks will do it. Therefore I have ventured to suggest the adoption of this course for your consideration as a possible—aye, not only possible, but, unless this state of things has a remedy, a probable event; for we must see to it that we protect ourselves and take a manly place among the nations of the earth. But I hear some friend of mine say, "I am afraid your scheme would bring down our provisions; and if we do not export them to England we shall find our Western markets still more depressed." Allow me, with great deference to your judgment, gentlemen, to suggest a remedy for that at the same time.

I would suggest that the exportation of gold be prohibited, and then there would be nothing to forward to meet the bills of exchange and pay for the goods we have bought, except our provisions. And, taking a hint from one of your best and most successful merchants, we could pay for our silks and satins in butter, and lard, and corn, and beef, and pork, and bring up the prices in the West, so that they could afford to pay the increased tariff in bringing them forward, now rendered necessary, I suppose, upon your railroads. And if our fair sisters and daughters will dress in silks, and satins, and laces, they will not feel any more troubled that a portion of the price goes to the Western farmer to enhance his gains instead of going into the coffers of a Jew banker in Wall Street.

You will observe, my friends, that in the list of grievances with which I charge England, I have not charged her with tampering with our leading politicians. So far as any evidence I have, I don't know that she is guilty; but what shall we say of our leading politicians that have tampered with her? I have read of it in the letters of Lord Lyons with much surprise—with more surprise than has been excited in me by any other fact of this war. I had, somehow, got an inkling of the various things that came up in previous instances, so I was not very much surprised at them; but when I so read a statement, deliberately put forward, that here in New York a leading politician had consulted with the British minister as to how these United States could be separated and broken up, every drop of blood in my veins boiled; and I would have liked to have met that leading politician. I do not know that Lord Lyons is to

blame. I suppose, sir, if a man comes to one of your clerks and offers to go into partnership with him to rob your neighbor's bank, and he reports him to you, you do not blame the clerk; but what do you do with the man who makes the offer?

I think we had better take a lesson from the action of Washington's administration: when the French minister, M. Genet, undertook even to address the people of the United States by letter, complaint was made to his government and he was recalled, and a law was passed preventing for all future time any interference by foreign diplomatists with the people of the United States.

I want to be understood—I have no evidence of any interference on the part of Lord Lyons; but he says in his letter to Earl Russell that, both before and after a certain event, leading politicians came to him and desired that he would do—what (I am giving the substance and not words) —desired that he would request his government not to interfere between the North and South. Why? Because it would aid the country not to interfere? No! Because, if England did interfere the country would spurn the interference, and be stronger than ever to crush the rebellion.

Mark again the insidious way in which the point was put. They knew how we felt because of the action of England; they knew that the heart of this people beat true to the Constitution, and that it could not brook any interference on the part of England. What, then, did these politicians do? They asked the British minister to use the influence of British diplomacy to induce other nations to interfere, but to take care that Great Britain should keep out of sight, lest we should see the cat under the meal. This is precisely the proposition that they made. You observe that in speaking of these men I have up to this moment used the word politicians. What kind of politicians? They cannot be Democratic politicians.

How I should like to hear Andrew Jackson say a few words upon such politicians who call themselves Democrats! ["He would hang them."] No, I don't think he would have an opportunity to do so; he never would be able to catch them. I have felt it my duty here, in the city of New York, because of the interest I have in public affairs,

to call attention to this most extraordinary fact—that there are men in the community so lost to patriotism, so bound up in the traditions of party, so selfish, as to be willing to tamper with Great Britain in order to bring about the separation of this country.

It is the most alarming fact that I have yet seen. I had rather see a hundred thousand men set in the field on the rebel side—aye, I had rather see Great Britain armed against us openly, as she is covertly—than to be forced to believe that there are amongst us such men as these, lineal descendants of Judas Iscariot, intermarried with the race of Benedict Arnold.

It has shown me a great danger with which we are threatened, and I call upon all true men to sustain the government—to be loyal to the government. As you, sir, were pleased to say, the present government was not the government of my choice—I did not vote for it, or for any part of it—but it is the government of my country, it is the only organ by which I can exert the force of the country to protect its integrity; and so long as I believe that government to be honestly administered I will throw a mantle over any mistakes that I may think it has made and support it heartily, with hand and purse, so help me God!

I have no loyalty to any man or men; my loyalty is to the government; and it makes no difference to me who the people have chosen to administer the government as long as the choice has been constitutionally made and the persons so chosen hold their places and powers. I am a traitor and a false man if I falter in my support. This is what I understand to be loyalty to a government; and I was sorry to learn, as I did the other day, that there was a man in New York who professed not to know the meaning of the word loyalty. I desire to say here that it is the duty of every man to be loyal to the government, to sustain it, to pardon its errors and help to rectify them, and to do all he can to aid it in carrying the country on in the course of glory and grandeur in which it was started by our fathers.

Let me say to you, my friends—to you, young men, that no man who opposed his country in time of war ever prospered. The Tory of the Revolution, the Hartford

Conventionist of 1812, the immortal seven who voted against the supplies for the Mexican War—all history is against these men. Let no politician of our day put himself in the way of the march of this country to glory and greatness, for whoever does so will surely be crushed. The course of our nation is onward, and let him who opposes it beware.

> "The mower mows on—though the adder may writhe,
> Or the copperhead coil round the blade of his scythe."

It only remains, sir, for me to repeat the expression of my gratitude to you and the citizens of New York here assembled for the kindness with which you and they have received me and listened to me, for which please again accept my thanks.

JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN

LAST SPEECH: SLAVERY

[John C. Calhoun, known in history as the father of a principle subversive of the American Union, yet lauded for his personal virtues, was born in the Calhoun settlement, district of Abbeville, S. C., in 1782. He began the study of law at Litchfield, Conn., and continued it at Charleston, being admitted to the bar in 1807. His progress through the legislature to a seat in Congress was accomplished in three years. Taking his seat in November, 1811, in the special session designed to precipitate the war with Great Britain, he was placed upon the committee of foreign relations and drafted its policy. Later he passed to the chairmanship. His success in Congress was so marked that the speakership was within his power on the resignation of Clay in 1814, but he declined the appointment. From the House of Representatives he entered President Monroe's cabinet as secretary of war, becoming after eight years the Vice-President with John Quincy Adams. After a quarrel with Jackson he resigned the office of Vice-President. He was elected at once to the Senate. He resigned from the Senate in 1843 and looked forward to the nomination to the presidency, but received little support outside his own state. His last days were spent in the Senate, where he chiefly defended the cause of slavery. He died March 31, 1850. The following speech was his last public effort. It shows clearly his fixed ideas on the subject of slavery, and was delivered in the Senate in 1850.]

I HAVE, senators, believed from the first that the agitation of the subject of slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion. Entertaining this opinion, I have, on all proper occasions, endeavored to call the attention of both of the two great parties which divide the country, to adopt some such measure to prevent so great a disaster, but without success. The agitation has been permitted to proceed, with almost no attempt to resist it, until it has reached a period when it can no longer be disguised or denied that the Union is in

danger. You have thus had forced upon you the greatest and the gravest question that ever can come under your consideration: How can the Union be preserved?

To give a satisfactory answer to this mighty question, it is indispensable to have an accurate and thorough knowledge of the nature and the character of the cause by which the Union is endangered. Without such knowledge it is impossible to pronounce, with any certainty, by what means it can be saved; just as it would be impossible for a physician to pronounce, in the case of some dangerous disease, with any certainty, by what remedy the patient could be saved, without similar knowledge of the nature and character of the cause of the disease. The first question, then, presented for consideration, in the investigation I propose, in order to obtain such knowledge, is, What is it that has endangered the Union?

To this question there can be but one answer: that the immediate cause is, the almost universal discontent which pervades all the states composing the Southern section of the Union. This widely extended discontent is not of recent origin. It commenced with the agitation of the slavery question, and has been increasing ever since. The next question is, What has caused this wide-diffused and almost universal discontent?

It is a great mistake to suppose, as is by some, that it originated with demagogues, who excited the discontent with the intention of aiding their personal advancement; or with disappointed, ambitious individuals, who resorted to it as the means of raising their fallen fortunes. There is no foundation for this opinion. On the contrary, all the great political influences of the section were arrayed against excitement, and exerted to the utmost to keep the public quiet. The great mass of the people of the South were divided, as in the other section, into Whigs and Democrats. The leaders and the presses of both parties in the South were very solicitous to prevent excitement, and restore quiet; because it was seen that the effects of the former would necessarily tend to weaken, if not destroy, the political ties which united them with their respective parties in the other section. Those who know the strength of party ties will readily appreciate the immense force which this

cause exerted against agitation, and in favor of preserving quiet. But, as great as it was, it was not sufficiently so to prevent the widespread discontent which now pervades the section. No; some cause far deeper and more powerful must exist, to produce a discontent so wide and deep, than the one inferred. The question then recurs, What is the cause of this discontent? It will be found in the belief of the people of the Southern States, as prevalent as the discontent itself, that they cannot remain, as things now are, consistently with honor and safety, in the Union. The next question, then, to be considered is, What has caused this belief?

One of the causes is, undoubtedly, to be traced to the long-continued agitation of the slave question on the part of the North, and the many aggressions which they have made on the rights of the South, during that time. I will not enumerate them at present, as it will be done hereafter in its proper place.

There is another, lying back of it, but with which this is intimately connected, that may be regarded as the great and primary cause. It is to be found in the fact that the equilibrium between the two sections in the government, as it stood when the Constitution was ratified, and the government put in action, has been destroyed. At that time there was nearly a perfect equilibrium between the two, which afforded ample means to each to protect itself against the aggression of the other; but as it now stands, one section has exclusive power of controlling the government, which leaves the other without any adequate means of protecting itself against its encroachment and oppression. To place this subject distinctly before you, I have, senators, prepared a brief statistical statement, showing the relative weight of the two sections in the government under the first census of 1790, and the last census of 1840.

According to the former, the population of the United States, including Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, which then were in their incipient condition of becoming states, but were not actually admitted, amounted to 3,929,827. Of this number, the Northern States had 1,977,899, and the Southern, 1,952,072, making a difference of only 25,827 in favor of the former states. The number of states,

including Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, was sixteen, of which eight, including Vermont, belonged to the Northern section, and eight, including Kentucky and Tennessee, to the Southern, making an equal division of the states between the two sections, under the first census. There was a small preponderance in the House of Representatives, and in the electoral college, in favor of the Northern, owing to the fact that, according to the provisions of the Constitution, in estimating federal numbers, five slaves count but three; but it was too small to affect sensibly the perfect equilibrium of numbers, which, with that exception, existed at that time, a true, perfect equilibrium. Such was the quality of the two sections when the states composing them agreed to enter into a federal union. Since then the equilibrium between them has been greatly disturbed.

According to the last census, the aggregate population of the United States amounted to 17,063,357, of which the Northern section contained 9,728,920, and the Southern 7,334,437, making a difference, in round numbers, of 2,400,000. The number of states had increased from sixteen to twenty-six, making an addition of ten states. In the meantime the position of Delaware had become doubtful as to which section she properly belonged. Considering her as neutral, the Northern States will have thirteen, and the Southern States twelve, making a difference in the Senate of two senators in favor of the former. According to the apportionment under the census of 1840, there were 223 members of the House of Representatives, of which the Northern States had 135, and the Southern States (considering Delaware as neutral), 87; making a difference in favor of the former, in the House of Representatives, of forty-eight; the difference in the Senate of two members added to this gives to the North, in the electoral college, a majority of fifty. Since the census of 1840, four states have been added to the Union: Iowa, Wisconsin, Florida, and Texas. They leave the difference in the Senate as it stood when the census was taken, but add two to the side of the North in the House, making the present majority in the House in its favor, of fifty, and in the electoral college, of fifty-two.

The result of the whole is to give the Northern section a predominance in every department of the government, and

thus concentrate in it the two elements which constitute the Federal Government—majority of states, and a majority of their population, estimated in federal numbers. Whatever section concentrates the two in itself, must possess control of the entire government.

But we are just at the close of the sixth decade, and the commencement of the seventh. The census is to be taken this year, which must add greatly to the decided preponderance of the North in the House of Representatives, and in the electoral college. The prospect is, also, that a great increase will be added to its present preponderance during the period of the decade, by the addition of new states. Two territories—Oregon and Minnesota—are already in progress, and strenuous efforts are making to bring in three additional states from the territory recently conquered from Mexico, which, if successful, will add three other states in a short time to the Northern section, making five states, and increasing its present number of states from fifteen to twenty, and of its senators from thirty to forty. On the contrary, there is not a single territory in progress in the Southern section, and no certainty that any additional state will be added to it during the decade. The prospect, then, is, that the two sections in the Senate, should the efforts now made to exclude the South from the newly conquered territories succeed, will stand, before the end of the decade, twenty Northern States to twelve Southern (conceding Delaware as neutral), and forty Northern senators to twenty-four Southern. This great increase of senators, added to the great increase of members of the House of Representatives, and electoral college, on the part of the North, which must take place upon the next decade, will effectually and eventually destroy the equilibrium which existed when the government commenced.

Had this destruction been the operation of time, without the interference of government, the South would have had no reason to complain; but such was not the fact. It was caused by the legislation of this government, which was appointed as the common agent of all, and charged with the protection of the interests and security of all. The legislation by which it has been effected may be classed under three heads.

The first is that series of acts by which the South has been excluded from the common territory belonging to all the states as the members of the Federal Union, which has had the effect of extending vastly the portion allotted to the Northern section, and restricting within narrow limits the portion left the South. The next consists in adopting a system of revenue and disbursements by which an undue proportion of the burden of taxation has been imposed upon the South, and an undue proportion of its proceeds appropriated to the North; and the last in a system of political measures by which the original character of the government has been radically changed.

I propose to bestow upon each of these, in the order they stand, a few remarks, with the view of showing that it is owing to the action of this government that the equilibrium between the two sections has been destroyed, and the whole power of the system centered in a sectional majority.

The first of the series of acts by which the South was deprived of its due share of the territories, originated with the confederacy, which preceded the existence of this government. It is to be found in the provisions of the ordinance of 1787. Its effect was to exclude the South entirely from that vast and fertile region which lies between the Ohio and the Mississippi, now embracing five states and one territory. The next of the series is the Missouri Compromise, which excluded the South from that large portion of Louisiana which lies north of 36° 30′, excepting what is included in the state of Missouri. The last of the series excludes the South from the whole of the Oregon territory. All these, in the slang of the day, were what is called slave territory, and not free soil; that is, territories belonging to slaveholding powers, and open to the emigration of masters with their slaves. By these several acts, the South was excluded from 1,238,025 square miles, an extent of country considerably exceeding the entire valley of the Mississippi. To the South was left the portion of the territory of Louisiana lying south of 36° 30′, and the portion north of it included in the state of Missouri; the portion lying south of 36° 30′ includes the states of Louisiana and Arkansas, and the territory lying west of the latter and south of 36° 30′, called the Indian country. A portion lying south of

this, with the territory of Florida, now the state, makes in the whole 283,503 square miles. To this must be added the territory acquired with Texas. If the whole should be added to the Southern section, it would make an increase of 325,520, which would make the whole left to the South 609,023. But a large part of Texas is still in contest between the two sections, which leaves uncertain what will be the real extent of the portion of her territory that may be left to the South.

I have not included the territory recently acquired by the treaty with Mexico. The North is making the most strenuous efforts to appropriate the whole to herself, by excluding the South from every foot of it. If she should succeed, it will add to that from which Southern laws have already been excluded 527,078 square miles, and would increase the whole the North has appropriated to herself to 1,764,023, not including the portion which she may succeed in excluding us from in Texas. To sum up the whole, the United States, since they declared their independence, have acquired 2,373,046 square miles of territory, from which the North will have excluded the South, if she should succeed in monopolizing the newly acquired territories, about three-fourths of the whole, and leave the South but about one-fourth.

Such is the first and great cause that has destroyed the equilibrium between the two sections in the government.

The next is the system of revenue and disbursements which has been adopted by the government. It is well known that the main source from which the government has derived its revenue is from duties on imports. I shall not undertake to show that all such duties must necessarily fall mainly on the exporting states, and that the South, as the great exporting portion of the Union, has in reality paid vastly more than her due proportion of the revenue, because I deem it unnecessary, as the subject has on so many occasions been fully discussed. Nor shall I, for the same reason, undertake to show that a far greater portion of the revenue has been disbursed at the North than its due share; and that the joint effect of these causes has been to transfer a vast amount from the South to the North, which, under an equal system of revenue and disbursement, would

not have been lost to her. If to this be added that many of the duties were imposed, not for revenue, but for protection, that is, intended to put money, not into the treasury, but directly into the pocket of the manufacturers, some conception may be formed of the immense amount which, in the long course of so many years, has been transferred from the South to the North. There is no data by which it can be estimated with any certainty; but it is safe to say that it amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars. Under the most moderate estimate, it would be sufficient to add greatly to the wealth of the North, and by that greatly increase her population, by attracting emigration from all quarters in that direction.

This, combined with the great and primary cause, amply explains why the North has acquired a preponderance over every department of the government, by its disproportionate increase of population and states. The former, as has been shown, has increased, in fifty years, 2,400,000 over that of the South. This increase of population, during so long a period, is satisfactorily accounted for by the number of emigrants, and the increase of their descendants, which have been attracted to the Northern section from Europe and the Southern section, in consequence of the advantages derived from the causes assigned. If they had not existed —if the South had retained all the capital which has been extracted from her by the fiscal action of the government, and if they had not been excluded, by the ordinance of 1787 and the Missouri Compromise, from the region lying between the Ohio and the Mississippi, and between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains, north of 36° 30′, it scarcely admits of a doubt that she would have divided the emigration with the North, and, by retaining her own people, would have at least equaled the North in population, under the census of 1840, and probably under that about to be taken. She would, also, if she had retained her equal rights in those territories, have maintained an equality in the number of states with the North, and have preserved the equilibrium between the two sections that existed at the commencement of the government. The loss, then, of the equilibrium is to be attributed to the action of this government.

But while these measures were destroying the equilibrium between the two sections, the action of the government was leading to a radical change in its character, by concentrating all the power of the system in itself. The occasion will not permit me to trace the measures by which this great change has been consummated. If it did, it would not be difficult to show that the process commenced at an early period of the government; that it proceeded almost without interruption, step by step, until it absorbed, virtually, its entire powers. Without, however, going through the whole process to establish the fact, it may be done satisfactorily by a very short statement.

That this government claims, and practically maintains, the right to decide in the last resort, as to the extent of its powers, will scarcely be denied by any one conversant with the political history of the country, is equally certain. That it also claims the right to resort to force, to maintain whatever power she claims against all opposition. Indeed, it is apparent from what we daily hear, that this has become the prevailing and fixed opinion of a great majority of the community. Now, I ask, what limitation can possibly be placed upon the powers of a government claiming and exercising such rights? And, if none can be, how can the separate government of the states maintain and protect the powers reserved to them by the Constitution, or the people of the several states maintain those which are reserved to them, and among them their sovereign powers, by which they ordained and established, not only their separate state constitutions and governments, but also the Constitution and government of the United States? But if they have no constitutional means of maintaining them against the right claimed by this government, it necessarily follows that they hold them at its pleasure and discretion, and that all the powers of the system are, in reality, concentrated in it. It also follows that the character of the government has been changed in consequence from a federal republic, as it originally came from the hands of its framers, and that it has been changed into a great national consolidated democracy. It has, indeed, at present, all the characteristics of the latter, and not one of the former, although it still retains its outward form.

The result of the whole of these causes combined is, that the North has acquired a decided ascendency over every department of this government, and, through it, a control over all the powers of the system. A single section, governed by the will of the numerical majority, has now, in fact, the control of the government, and the entire powers of the system. What was once a constitutional federal republic, is now converted, in reality, into one as absolute as that of the Autocrat of Russia, and as despotic in its tendency as any absolute government that ever existed.

As, then, the North has the absolute control over the government, it is manifest that, on all questions between it and the South, where there is a diversity of interests, the interest of the latter will be sacrificed to the former, however oppressive the effects may be, as the South possesses no means by which it can resist, through the action of the government. But if there were no questions of vital importance to the South, in reference to which there was a diversity of views between the two sections, this state of things might be endured, without the hazard of destruction, by the South. But such is not the fact. There is a question of vital importance to the Southern section, in reference to which the views and feelings of the two sections are opposite and hostile as they can possibly be.

I refer to the relations between the two races in the Southern section, which constitutes a vital portion of her social organization. Every portion of the North entertains views and feelings more or less hostile to it. Those most opposed and hostile regard it as a sin, and consider themselves under the most sacred obligation to use every effort to destroy it. Indeed, to the extent that they conceive they have power, they regard themselves as implicated in the sin, and responsible for suppressing it, by the use of all and every means. Those less opposed and hostile regard it as a crime—an offense against humanity, as they call it, and, although not so fanatical, feel themselves bound to use all efforts to effect the same object. While those who are least opposed and hostile regard it as a blot and a stain on the character of what they call a nation, and feel themselves accordingly bound to give it no countenance or support. On the contrary, the Southern section regards

the relation as one which cannot be destroyed without subjecting the two races to the greatest calamity, and the section to poverty, desolation, and wretchedness, and accordingly feels bound, by every consideration of interest, safety, and duty, to defend it.

This hostile feeling on the part of the North toward the social organization of the South long lay dormant; but it only required some cause, which would make the impression on those who felt most intensely that they were responsible for its continuance, to call it into action. The increasing power of this government, and of the control of the Northern section over all of it, furnished the cause. It was they made an impression on the minds of many that there was little or no restraint to prevent the government to do whatever it might choose to do. This was sufficient of itself to put the most fanatical portion of the North in action, for the purpose of destroying the existing relation between the two races in the South.

The first organized movement toward it commenced in 1835. Then, for the first time, societies were organized, presses established, lecturers sent forth to excite the people of the North, and incendiary publications scattered over the whole South through the mail. The South was thoroughly aroused; meetings were held everywhere, and resolutions adopted, calling upon the North to apply a remedy to arrest the threatened evil, and pledging themselves to adopt measures for their own protection if it was not arrested. At the meeting of Congress petitions poured in from the North, calling upon Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and to prohibit what they called the internal slave trade between the states, avowing, at the same time, that their ultimate object was to abolish slavery, not only in the District of Columbia, but in the states and throughout the Union. At this period the number engaged in the agitation was small, and it possessed little or no personal influence.

Neither party in Congress had, at that time, any sympathy for them or their cause; the members of each party presented their petitions with great reluctance. Nevertheless, as small and as contemptible as the party then was, both of the great parties of the North dreaded them. They

felt that, though small, they were organized, in reference to a subject which had a great and a commanding influence over the Northern mind. Each party, on that account, feared to oppose their petitions, lest the opposite party should take advantage of the one who opposed by favoring them. The effect was that both united in insisting that the petitions should be received, and Congress take jurisdiction of the subject for which they prayed; and, to justify their course, took the extraordinary ground that Congress was bound to receive petitions on every subject, however objectionable it might be, and whether they had, or had not, jurisdiction over the subject. These views prevailed in the House of Representatives, and partially in the Senate, and thus the party succeeded in their first movement in gaining what they proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agitation could be extended over the whole Union. This was the commencement of the agitation, which has ever since continued, and which, as it is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union itself.

As to myself, I believed, at that early period, that, if the party who got up the petitions should succeed in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that agitation would follow, and that it would, in the end, if not arrested, destroy the Union. I then so expressed myself in debate, and called upon both parties to take grounds against taking jurisdiction, but in vain. Had my voice been heard, and Congress refused taking jurisdiction by the united votes of all parties, the agitation which followed would have been prevented, and the fanatical movements accompanying the agitation, which have brought us to our present perilous condition, would have become extinct for the want of something to feed the flame. That was the time for the North to show her devotion to the Union; but, unfortunately, both of the great parties of that section were so intent on obtaining or retaining party ascendency, that all other considerations were overlooked or else forgotten.

What has since followed are but natural consequences. With the success of their first movement, this small fanatical party began to acquire strength, and with that, to become an object of courtship of both of the great parties. The necessary consequence was a further increase of power,

and a gradual tainting of the opinions of both of the other parties with their doctrines, until the infection has extended over both, and the great mass of the population of the North, who, whatever may be their opinion of the original Abolition party, which still keeps up its distinctive organization, hardly ever fail, when it comes to acting, to cooperate in carrying out their measures. With the increase of their influence, they extend the sphere of their action. In a short period after they had commenced their first movement, they had acquired sufficient influence to induce the legislatures of most of the Northern States to pass acts, which, in effect, abrogated the provision of the Constitution that provides for the delivering up of fugitive slaves. Not long after, petitions followed to abolish slavery in forts, magazines, and dockyards, and all other places where Congress had exclusive power of legislation. This was followed by petitions, and resolutions of legislatures of the Northern States, and popular meetings to exclude the Southern States from all territories acquired, or to be acquired, and to prevent the admission of any state hereafter into the Union which, by its constitution, does not prohibit slavery. And Congress is invoked to do all this, expressly with the view of the final abolition of slavery in the states. That has been avowed to be the ultimate object, from the beginning of the agitation until the present time, and yet the great body of both parties of the North, with the full knowledge of the fact, although disowning the Abolitionists, have cooperated with them in almost all their measures.

Such is a brief history of the agitation, as far as it has yet advanced. Now, I ask, senators, what is there to prevent its further progress, until it fulfils the ultimate end proposed, unless some decisive measure should be adopted to prevent it? Has any one of the causes which have added to its increase from its original small and contemptible beginning until it has attained its present magnitude, diminished in force? Is the original cause of the movement—that slavery is a sin, and ought to be suppressed—weaker now than at the commencement? or is the Abolition party less numerous or influential? or have they less influence over elections? or less control over the two great parties of the North in elections? or has the South greater

means of influencing or controlling the movements of this government now than it had when the agitation commenced? To all these questions but one answer can be given. No. No. No. The very reverse is true. Instead of weaker, all the elements in favor of agitation are stronger now than they were in 1835, when the agitation first commenced. While all the elements of influence on the part of the South are weakened, I again ask, what is to stop this agitation, unless something decisive is done, until the great and final object at which it aims—the abolition of slavery in the South—is consummated? Is it, then, not certain that, if something decisive is not now done to arrest it, the South will be forced to choose between abolition or secession? Indeed, as events are now moving, it will not require the South to secede, to dissolve the Union; agitation will of itself effect it, of which its past history furnishes abundant proof, as I shall next proceed to show.

It is a great mistake to suppose that disunion can be effected by a single blow. The cords which bound these states together in one common union are far too numerous and powerful for that. Disunion must be the work of time. It is only through a long process, and in succession, that the cords can snap, until the whole fabric falls asunder. Already the agitation of the slavery question has snapped some of the most important, and has greatly weakened all the others, as I shall proceed to show.

The cords that bind the states together are not only many, but various in character. Among them, some are spiritual or ecclesiastical; some political; others social; others appertain to the benefits conferred by the Union; and others to the feeling of duty and obligation.

The strongest of those of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature consisted in the unity of the great religious denominations, all of which originally embraced the Union. All these denominations, with the exception, perhaps, of the Catholics, were organized very much upon the principle of our political institutions. Beginning with smaller meetings, corresponding with the political divisions of the country, their organization terminated in one great central assemblage, corresponding very much with the character of Congress. At these meetings, the principal clergymen and lay

members of the respective denominations from all parts of the Union met, to transact business relating to their common concerns. It was not confined to what appertained to the doctrines and disciplines of the respective denominations, but extended to plans for disseminating the Bible, establishing missionaries, distributing tracts, and of establishing presses for the publication of tracts, newspapers, and periodicals, with a view of diffusing religious information, and for the support of the doctrines and creeds of the denomination. All this, combined, contributed greatly to strengthen the bonds of the Union. The strong ties which held each denomination together, formed a strong cord to hold the whole Union together; but, as powerful as they were, they have not been able to resist the explosive effect of slavery agitation.

The first of these cords which snapped under its explosive force was that of the powerful Methodist Episcopal Church. The numerous and strong ties which held it together are all broken, and its unity gone. They now form separate churches, and, instead of that feeling of attachment and devotion to the interests of the whole church, which was formerly felt, they are now arrayed into two hostile bodies, engaged in litigation about what was formerly their common property.

The next cord that snapped was that of the Baptists, one of the largest and most respectable of the denominations; that of the Presbyterians is not entirely snapped, but some of its strands have given way; that of the Episcopal Church is the only one of the four great Protestant denominations which remains unbroken and entire. The strongest cord of a political character consists of the many and strong ties that have held together the two great parties, which have, with some modifications, existed from the beginning of the government. They both extended to every portion of the Union, and had strongly contributed to hold all its parts together. But this powerful cord has proved no better than the spiritual. It resisted for a long time the explosive tendency of the agitation, but has finally snapped under its force—if not entirely, nearly so. Nor is there one of the remaining cords which has not been greatly weakened. To this extent the Union has already been de-

stroyed by agitation in the only way it can be, by snapping asunder and weakening the cords which bind it together.

If the agitation goes on, the same force acting with increased intensity, as has been shown, there will be nothing left to hold the states together except force. But, surely, that can with no propriety of language be called a union, when the only means by which the weaker is held connected with the stronger portion is force. It may, indeed, keep them connected, but the connection will partake much more of the character of subjugation, on the part of the weaker to the stronger, than the union of free, independent, and sovereign states in one federal union, as they stood in the early stages of the government, and which only is worthy of the sacred name of union.

Having now, senators, explained what it is that endangers the Union, and traced it to its cause, and explained its nature and character, the great question again recurs, How can the Union be saved? To this I answer, There is but one way by which it can be, and that is, by adopting such measures as will satisfy the states belonging to the Southern section, that they can remain in the Union consistently with their honor and their safety. There is, again, only one way by which that can be effected, and that is, by reviewing the causes by which this belief has been produced. Do that, and discontent will cease, harmony and kind feelings between the sections be restored, and every apprehension of danger to the Union removed. The question then is, By what means can this be done? But before I undertake to answer this question, I propose to show by what it cannot be done.

It cannot, then, be done by eulogies on the Union, however splendid or numerous. The cry of Union! Union! the glorious Union! can no more prevent disunion, than the cry of Health! health! glorious health! on the part of the physician can save a patient lying dangerously ill. So long as the Union, instead of being regarded as a protector, is regarded in the opposite character by not much less than a majority of the states, it will be in vain to attempt to concentrate them by pronouncing eulogies on it.

Besides, this cry of Union comes commonly from those whom we cannot believe to be sincere. It usually comes

JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN

Photogravure after an engraving


PUBLIC LIBRA
ASTOR
TILDEN

from our assailants; but we cannot believe them to be sincere, for if they loved the Union, they would necessarily be devoted to the Constitution. It made the Union, and to destroy the Constitution would be to destroy the Union. But the only reliable and certain evidence of devotion to the Constitution is, to abstain, on the one hand, from violating it, and to repel, on the other, all attempts to violate it. It is only by faithfully performing those high duties that the Constitution can be preserved, and with it the Union.

But how, then, stands the profession of devotion to the Union by our assailants, when brought to this test? Have they abstained from violating the Constitution? Let the many acts passed by the Northern States, to set aside and annul the clause of the Constitution providing for the delivery of fugitive slaves, answer. I cite this, not that it is the only instance (for there are many others), but because the violation, in this particular, is too notorious and palpable to be denied. Again, have they stood forth faithfully to repel violations of the Constitution? Let their course in reference to the agitation of the slavery question, which was commenced and has been carried on for fifteen years, avowedly for the purpose of abolishing slavery in the states —an object all acknowledged to be unconstitutional— answer. Let them show a single instance, during this long period, in which they have denounced the agitators, or their many attempts to effect what is admitted to be unconstitutional, or a single measure which they have brought forward for that purpose. How can we, with all these facts before us, believe that they are sincere in their profession of devotion to the Union, or avoid believing that, by assuming the cloak of patriotism, their profession is but intended to increase the vigor of their assaults, and to weaken the force of our resistance?

Nor can we regard the profession of devotion to the Union, on the part of those who are not our assailants, as sincere, when they pronounce eulogies upon the Union evidently with the intent of charging us with disunion, without uttering one word of denunciation against our assailants. If friends of the Union, their course should be to unite with us in repelling these assaults, and denouncing the authors

as enemies of the Union. Why they avoid this and pursue the course they obviously do, it is for them to explain.

Nor can the Union be saved by invoking the name of the illustrious Southerner, whose mortal remains repose on the western bank of the Potomac. He was one of us—a slaveholder and a planter. We have studied his history, and find nothing in it to justify submission to wrong. On the contrary, his great fame rests on the solid foundation that, while he was careful to avoid doing wrong to others, he was prompt and decided in repelling wrong. I trust that, in this respect, we profited by his example.

Nor can we find anything in his history to deter us from seceding from the Union, should it fail to fulfil the objects for which it was instituted, by being permanently and hopelessly converted into the means of oppression instead of protection. On the contrary, we find much in his example to encourage us, should we be forced to the extremity of deciding between submission and disunion.

There existed then, as well as now, a union—that between the parent country and her then colonies. It was a union which had much to endear it to the people of the colonies. Under its protecting and superintending care, the colonies were planted, and grew up, and prospered through a long course of years, until they became populous and wealthy. Its benefits were not limited to them. Their extensive agricultural and other productions gave birth to a flourishing commerce, which richly rewarded the parent country for the trouble and expense of establishing and protecting them. Washington was born and nurtured, and grew up to manhood under that union. He acquired his early distinction in its service; and there is every reason to believe he was devotedly attached to it. But his devotion was a rational one. He was attached to it, not as an end, but as a means to an end. When it failed to fulfil its end, and, instead of affording protection, was converted into the means of oppressing the colonies, he did not hesitate to draw his sword, and head the great movement by which that union was forever severed and the independence of these states established. This was the great and crowning glory of his life, which has spread his fame over the whole globe, and will transmit it to the latest posterity.

Nor can the plan proposed by the distinguished senator from Kentucky, nor that of the administration, save the Union. I shall pass by, without remark, the plan proposed by the senator, and proceed directly to the consideration of that of the administration. I, however, assure the distinguished and able senator that, in taking this course, no disrespect whatever is intended to him or his plan. I have adopted it, because so many senators of distinguished abilities, who were present when he delivered his speech and explanation of his plan, and who were fully capable to do justice to the side they support, have replied to him.

The plan of the administration cannot save the Union, because it can have no effect toward satisfying the states composing the Southern section of the Union that they can consistently with safety and honor remain in the Union. It is, in fact, but a modification of the Wilmot proviso. It proposes to effect the same object—to exclude the South from all the territory acquired by the Mexican treaty. It is well known that the South is united against the Wilmot proviso, and has committed itself by solemn resolutions to resist, should it be adopted. Its opposition is not to the name, but to that which it proposes to effect. That the Southern States hold it to be unconstitutional, unjust, inconsistent with their equality as members of the common Union, and calculated to destroy, irretrievably, the equilibrium between the two sections. These objections equally apply to what, for brevity, I will call the executive proviso. There is no difference between it and the Wilmot, except in the mode of effecting the object; and in that respect, I must say that the latter is much the least objectionable. It goes to its object openly, boldly, and directly. It claims for Congress unlimited power over the territories, and proposes to assert it over the territories acquired from Mexico, by a positive prohibition of slavery. Not so the executive proviso. It takes an indirect course, and, in order to elude the Wilmot proviso, and thereby avoid encountering the united and determined resistance of the South, it denies, by implication, the authority of Congress to legislate for the territories, and claims the right as belonging exclusively to the inhabitants of the territories. But to effect the object of excluding the South, it takes care, in the meantime,

of letting in emigrants from the Northern States and other quarters, except emigrants from the South, which it takes special care to exclude, by holding up to them the dread of having their slaves liberated under the Mexican laws. The necessary consequence is to exclude the South from the territory, just as effectually as would the Wilmot proviso. The only difference in this respect is, that what one proposes to effect directly and openly, the other proposes to effect indirectly and covertly.

But the executive proviso is more objectionable still than the Wilmot, in another and more important particular. The latter, to effect its object, inflicts a dangerous wound upon the Constitution, by depriving the Southern States, as joint partners and owners of the territories, of their rights in them; but it inflicts no greater wound than is absolutely necessary to effect its object. The former, on the contrary, while it inflicts the same wound, inflicts others equally great, and if possible greater, as I shall next proceed to explain.

In claiming the right for the inhabitants, instead of Congress, to legislate over the territories, in the executive proviso, it assumes that the sovereignty over the territories is vested in the former; or, to express it in the language used in a resolution offered by one of the senators from Texas [General Houston, now absent], "They have the same inherent right of self-government as the people in the states." The assumption is utterly false, unconstitutional, without example, and contrary to the entire practise of the government, from its commencement to the present time, as I shall next proceed to show.

The recent movement of individuals in California to form a constitution and a state government, and to appoint senators and representatives, is the first fruit of this monstrous assumption. If the individuals who have made this movement had gone into California as adventurers, and if, as such, they had conquered the territory, and established their independence, the sovereignty of the country would have been vested in them as a separate and independent community. In that case, they would have had the right to form a constitution, and to establish a government for themselves; and if after that they had thought proper to

apply to Congress for admission into the Union as a sovereign and independent state, all this would have been regular and according to established principles. But such is not the case. It was the United States who conquered California, and, finally, acquired it by treaty. The sovereignty, of course, is vested in them, and not in the individuals who have attempted to form a constitution as a state, without their consent. All this is clear beyond controversy, except it can be shown that they have since lost or been divested of their sovereignty.

Nor is it less clear that the power of legislating over the territory is vested in Congress, and not, as is assumed, in the inhabitants of the territories. None can deny that the Government of the United States has the power to acquire territories, either by war or by treaty; but if the power to acquire exists, it belongs to Congress to carry it into execution. On this point there can be no doubt, for the Constitution expressly provides that Congress shall have power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers" (those vested in Congress), "and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." It matters not, then, where the power is vested; for, if vested at all in the Government of the United States, or any of its departments or officers, the power carrying it into execution is clearly vested in Congress. But this important proviso, while it gives to Congress the power of legislating over territories, imposes important restrictions on its exercise, by restricting Congress to passing laws necessary and proper for carrying the power into execution. The prohibition extends, not only to all laws not suitable or appropriate to the object, but also to all that are unjust, unequal, or unfair, for all such laws would be unnecessary and improper, and, therefore, unconstitutional.

Having now established, beyond controversy, that the sovereignty over the territories is vested in the United States—that is, in the several states composing the Union—and that the power of legislating over them is expressly vested in Congress, it follows that the individuals in California who have undertaken to form a constitution and a

state, and to exercise the power of legislation, without the consent of Congress, have usurped the sovereignty of the states and the authority of Congress, and have acted in open defiance of both. In other words, what they have done is revolutionary and rebellious in its character, anarchical in its tendency, and calculated to lead to the most dangerous consequences. Had they acted from premeditation and design, it would have been, in fact, an act of rebellion, but such is not the case. The blame lies much less upon them than upon those who have induced them to take a course so unconstitutional and dangerous. They have been led into it by language held here, and the course pursued by the executive branch of the government.

I have not seen the answer of the executive to the calls made by the two houses of Congress, for information as to the course which it took, or the part which it acted, in reference to what was done in California. I understand the answers have not yet been printed. But there is enough known to justify the assertion, that those who profess to represent and act under the authority of the executive, have advised, aided, and encouraged the movement which terminated in forming what they call a constitution and a state. General Riley, who professed to act as civil governor, called the convention, determined on the number and distribution of the delegates, appointed the time and place of its meeting, was present during the session, and gave its proceedings his approbation and sanction. If he acted without authority, he ought to have been tried, or, at least, reprimanded and disarmed. Neither having been done, the presumption is that his course has been approved. This, of itself, is sufficient to identify the executive with his acts, and to make it responsible for them. I touch not the question whether General Riley was appointed or received the instructions under which he professed to act, from the present executive or its predecessor. If from the former, it would implicate the preceding as well as the present administration. If not, the responsibility rests exclusively on the present.

It is manifest, from this statement, that the executive department has undertaken to perform acts, preparatory to the meeting of the individuals to form their so-called

constitution and state government, which appertain exclusively to Congress. Indeed, they are identical in many respects with the provisions adopted by Congress, when it gives permission to a territory to form a constitution and a government, in order to be admitted as a state into the Union.

Having now shown that the assumption upon which the executive and the individuals in California acted, throughout this whole affair, is informal, unconstitutional, and dangerous, it remains to make a few remarks, in order to show that what has been done is contrary to the entire practise of government, from its commencement to the present time.

From its commencement until the time that Michigan was admitted, the practise was uniform. Territorial governments were first organized by Congress. The Government of the United States appointed the governors, judges, secretaries, marshals, and other officers, and the inhabitants of the territory were represented by legislative bodies, whose acts were subject to the revision of Congress. This state of things continued until the government of a territory applied to Congress to permit its inhabitants to form a constitution and government, preparatory to admission into the Union. The preliminary act to giving permission was to ascertain whether the inhabitants were sufficiently numerous to authorize them to be formed into a state. This was done by taking a census. That being done, and the number proving sufficient, permission was granted. The act granting it fixed all the preliminaries—the time and place of holding the convention; the qualification of the voters; establishing its boundaries, and all other measures necessary to be settled previous to admission. The act giving permission necessarily withdraws the sovereignty of the United States, and leaves the inhabitants of the incipient state as free to form their constitution and government as were the original states of the Union, after they had declared their independence. At this stage, the inhabitants of the territory became for the first time a people, in legal and constitutional language. Prior to this they were, by the old acts of Congress, called inhabitants, and not people. All this is perfectly consistent with the sovereignty of the

United States, with the powers of Congress, and with the right of a people to self-government.

Michigan was the first case in which there was any departure from the uniform rule of acting. Hers was a very slight departure from established usage. The ordinance of '87 secured to her the right of becoming a state when she should have 60,000 inhabitants. Owing to some neglect, Congress delayed taking the census. In the meantime, her population increased until it clearly exceeded more than twice the number which entitled her to admission. At this stage she formed a constitution and government, without the census being taken by the United States, and Congress received the admission without going through the formality of taking it, as there was no doubt she had more than a sufficient number to entitle her to admission. She was not admitted at the first session she applied, owing to some difficulty respecting the boundary between her and Ohio. The great irregularity as to her admission took place at the next session, but on a point which can have no possible connection with the case of California.

The irregularities in all other cases that have since occurred are of a similar character. In all, there existed territorial governments established by Congress, with officers appointed by the United States. In all, the territorial government took the lead in calling conventions, and fixing preliminaries, preparatory to the formation of a constitution, and admission into the Union. They all recognized the sovereignty of the United States, and the authority of Congress over the territories; and, whenever there was any departure from established usage, it was done on the presumed consent of Congress, and not in defiance of its authority, or the sovereignty of the United States over the territories. In this respect California stands alone, without usage, or a single example to cover her case.

It belongs now, senators, for you to decide what part you will act in reference to this unprecedented transaction. The executive has laid the paper, purporting to be the Constitution of California, before you, and asks you to admit her into the Union as a state, and the question is, Will you, or will you not, admit her? It is a grave question, and there rests upon you a heavy responsibility. Much,

very much, will depend upon your decision. If you admit her, you indorse and give your sanction to all that has been done. Are you prepared to do so? Are you prepared to surrender your power of legislation for the territories—a power expressly vested in Congress by the Constitution, as has been fully established? Can you, consistent with your oath to support the Constitution, surrender it? Are you prepared to admit that the inhabitants of the territories possess the sovereignty over them; and that any number, more or less, may claim any extent of territory they please; may form a constitution and government, and erect it into a state, without asking your permission? Are you prepared to surrender the sovereignty of the United States over whatever territory may be hereafter acquired, to the first adventurers who may rush into it? Are you prepared to surrender virtually to the executive department all the powers which you have heretofore exercised over the territories? If not, how can you, consistently with your duty and your oath to support the Constitution, give your assent to the admission of California as a state, under a pretended constitution and government? Can you believe that the project of a constitution which they have adopted has the least validity? Can you believe that there is such a state, in reality, as the State of California? No; there is no such state. It has no legal or constitutional existence. It has no validity, and can have none, without your sanction. How, then, can you admit it as a state, when, according to the provisions of the Constitution, your power is limited to admitting new states? That is, they must be states, existing states, independent of your sanction, before you can admit them. When you give your permission to the inhabitants of a territory to form a constitution and a state, the constitution and state they form derive their authority from the people, and not from you. The state, before admitted, is actually a state, and does not become so by the act of admission, as would be the case with California, should you admit her, contrary to constitutional provisions and established usage heretofore.

The senators on the other side of the chamber must permit me to make a few remarks in this connection, particularly applicable to them. With the exception of a few

senators from the South, sitting on that side of the chamber, when the Oregon question was before this body, not two years since, you took, if I mistake not, universally, the ground that Congress had the sole and absolute power of legislating for the territories. How, then, can you now, after the short interval which has elapsed, abandon the ground which you then took, and thereby virtually admit that the power of legislating, instead of being in Congress, is in the inhabitants of the territories? How can you justify and sanction by your votes the acts of the executive, which are in direct derogation to what you then contended for? But, to approach still nearer to the present time, how can you, after condemning, little more than a year since, the grounds taken by the party which you defeated at the last election, wheel round and support by your votes the grounds which, as explained by the candidate of the party at the last election, are identical with those on which the executive has acted in reference to California? What are we to understand by all this? Must we conclude that there is no sincerity, no faith, in the acts and declarations of public men, and that all is mere acting or hollow profession? Or, are we to conclude that the exclusion of the South from the territories acquired from Mexico is an object of so paramount a character in your estimation, that right, justice, Constitution, and consistency must all yield, when they stand in the way of our exclusion?

But, it may be asked, what is to be done with California, should she not be admitted? I answer, remand her back to the territorial condition, as was done in the case of Tennessee, in the early stage of the government. Congress, in her case, had established a territorial government, in the usual form, with a governor, judges, and other officers appointed by the United States. She was entitled, under the deed of cession, to be admitted into the Union as a state, as soon as she had 60,000 inhabitants. The territorial government, believing it had that number, took a census by which it appeared it exceeded it. She then formed a constitution and a state, and applied for admission. Congress refused to admit her, on the grounds that the census should be taken by the United States, and that Congress had not determined whether the territory should be formed into one

or two states, as it was authorized to do, under the cession. She returned quietly to her territorial condition. An act was passed to take a census by the United States, and providing that the territory should form one state. All afterward was regularly conducted, and the territory admitted as a state in due form. The irregularities in the case of California are immeasurably greater, and afford a much stronger reason for pursuing the same course. But, it may be said, California may not submit. That is not probable; but, if she should not, when she refuses, it will then be the time for us to decide what is to be done.

Having now shown what cannot save the Union, I return to the question with which I commenced: How can the Union be saved? There is but one way by which it can, with any certainty, be saved, and that is a full and final settlement, on the principles of justice, of all the questions at issue between the two sections. The South asks for justice, simple justice, and less she ought not to take. She has no compromise to offer but the Constitution, and no concessions or surrender to make. She has already surrendered so much that she has little left to surrender. Such a settlement would go to the root of the evil, remove all cause of discontent, and satisfy the South that she could remain honestly and safely in the Union, and thereby restore the harmony and fraternal feeling between the sections, which existed anterior to the Missouri agitation. Nothing else can, with any certainty, finally and forever settle the question at issue, terminate agitation, and save the Union.

But can this be done? Yes, easily; not by the weaker party, for it can of itself do nothing—not even protect itself—but by the stronger. The North has only to will it, to do justice, and perform her duty, in order to accomplish it—to do justice by conceding to the South an equal right in the acquired territory; and to do her duty by causing the stipulations relative to fugitive slaves to be faithfully fulfilled—to cease the agitation of the slave question, and provide for the insertion of a provision in the Constitution by an amendment which will restore in substance the power she possessed of protecting herself before the equilibrium between the sections was destroyed by the action of this

government. There will be no difficulty in devising such a provision—one that will protect the South, and which, at the same time, will improve and strengthen the government, instead of impairing or weakening it.

But, will the North agree to this? It is for her to answer this question. But, I will say, she cannot refuse if she has half the love of the Union which she professes to have, or without justly exposing herself to the charge that her love of power and aggrandizement is far greater than her love of the Union. At all events, the responsibility of saving the Union is on the North, and not the South. The South cannot save it by any act of hers, and the North may save it without any sacrifice whatever, unless to do justice and to perform her duties under the Constitution be regarded by her as a sacrifice.

It is time, senators, that there should be an open and manly avowal on all sides as to what is intended to be done. If the question is not now settled, it is uncertain whether it ever can hereafter be, and we, as the representatives of the states of this Union, regarded as governments, should come to a distinct understanding as to our respective views, in order to ascertain whether the great questions at issue between the two sections can be settled or not. If you, who represent the stronger portion, cannot agree to settle them on the broad principle of justice and duty, say so, and let the states we represent agree to separate, and part in peace. If you are willing we should part in peace, tell us so, and we shall know what to do when you reduce the question to submission or resistance. If you remain silent, you then compel us to infer what you intend. In that case, California will become the test question. If you admit her under all the difficulties that oppose her admission, you compel us to infer that you intend to exclude us from the whole of the acquired territories, with the intention of destroying irretrievably the equilibrium between the two sections. We would be blind not to perceive, in that case, that your real objects are power and aggrandizement; and infatuated, not to act accordingly.

I have now, senators, done my duty, in expressing my opinions fully, freely, and candidly on this solemn occasion. In doing so, I have been governed by the motives

which have governed me in all the stages of the agitation of the slavery question since its commencement, and exerted myself to arrest it, with the intention of saving the Union, if it could be done, and, if it cannot, to save the section where it has pleased Providence to cast my lot, and which, I sincerely believe, has justice and the Constitution on its side. Having faithfully done my duty to the best of my ability, both to the Union and my section, throughout the whole of this agitation, I shall have the consolation, let what will come, that I am free from all responsibility.

ON NULLIFICATION AND THE FORCE BILL

MR. PRESIDENT: At the last session of Congress it was avowed on all sides that the public debt, as to all practical purposes, was in fact paid, the small surplus remaining being nearly covered by the money in the treasury and the bonds for duties which had already accrued; but with the arrival of this event our last hope was doomed to be disappointed. After a long session of many months, and the most earnest effort on the part of South Carolina and the other Southern states to obtain relief, all that could be effected was a small reduction in the amount of the duties, but a reduction of such a character that, while it diminished the amount of burden, it distributed that burden more unequally than even the obnoxious act of 1828; reversing the principle adopted by the bill of 1816, of laying higher duties on the unprotected than the protected articles, by repealing almost entirely the duties laid upon the former, and imposing the burden almost entirely on the latter. It was thus that, instead of relief—instead of an equal distribution of burdens and benefits of the government, on the payment of the debt, as had been fondly anticipated—the duties were so arranged as to be, in fact, bounties on one side and taxation on the other; thus placing the two great sections of the country in direct conflict in reference to its fiscal action, and thereby letting in that flood of political corruption which threatened to sweep away our Constitution and our liberty.

This unequal and unjust arrangement was pronounced, both by the administration, through its proper organ, the secretary of the treasury, and by the opposition, to be a *permanent* adjustment; and it was thus that all hope of relief through the action of the general government terminated; and the crisis so long apprehended at length arrived, at which the state was compelled to choose between absolute acquiescence in a ruinous system of oppression, or a resort to her reserved powers—powers of which she alone was the rightful judge, and which only, in this momentous juncture, could save her. She determined on the latter.

The consent of two-thirds of her legislature was necessary for the call of a convention, which was considered the only legitimate organ through which the people, in their sovereignty, could speak. After an arduous struggle the states-right party succeeded; more than two-thirds of both branches of the legislature favorable to a convention were elected; a convention was called—the ordinance adopted. The convention was succeeded by a meeting of the legislature, when the laws to carry the ordinance into execution were enacted—all of which have been communicated by the President, have been referred to the committee on the judiciary, and this bill is the result of their labor.

Having now corrected some of the prominent misrepresentations as to the nature of this controversy, and given a rapid sketch of the movement of the state in reference to it, I will next proceed to notice some objections connected with the ordinance and the proceedings under it.

The first and most prominent of these is directed against what is called the test oath, which an effort has been made to render odious. So far from deserving the denunciation that has been leveled against it, I view this provision of the ordinance as but the natural result of the doctrines entertained by the state and the position which she occupies. The people of Carolina believe that the Union is a union of states, and not of individuals; that it was formed by the states, and that the citizens of the several states were bound to it through the acts of their several states; that each state ratified the Constitution for itself, and that it was only by such ratification of a state that any obligation was imposed upon its citizens. Thus believing, it is the opinion of the

people of Carolina that it belongs to the state which has imposed the obligation to declare, in the last resort, the extent of this obligation, as far as her citizens are concerned; and this upon the plain principles which exist in all analogous cases of compact between sovereign bodies. On this principle the people of the state, acting in their sovereign capacity in convention, precisely as they did in the adoption of their own and the Federal Constitution, have declared, by the ordinance, that the acts of Congress which imposed duties under the authority to lay imposts, were acts not for revenue, as intended by the Constitution, but for protection, and therefore null and void. The ordinance thus enacted by the people of the state themselves, acting as a sovereign community, is as obligatory on the citizens of the state as any portion of the Constitution. In prescribing, then, the oath to obey the ordinance, no more was done than to prescribe an oath to obey the Constitution. It is, in fact, but a particular oath of allegiance, and in every respect similar to that which is prescribed, under the Constitution of the United States, to be administered to all the officers of the state and federal governments; and is no more deserving the harsh and bitter epithets which have been heaped upon it than that or any other similar oath. It ought to be borne in mind that, according to the opinion which prevails in Carolina, the right of resistance to the unconstitutional acts of Congress belongs to the state, and not to her individual citizens; and that, though the latter may, in a mere question of *meum* and *tuum*, resist through the courts an unconstitutional encroachment upon their rights, yet the final stand against usurpation rests not with them, but with the state of which they are members; and such act of resistance by a state binds the conscience and allegiance of the citizen. But there appears to be a general misapprehension as to the extent to which the state has acted under this part of the ordinance. Instead of sweeping every officer by a general proscription of the minority, as has been represented in debate, as far as my knowledge extends not a single individual has been removed. The state has, in fact, acted with the greatest tenderness, all circumstances considered, toward citizens who differed from the majority; and, in that spirit, has

directed the oath to be administered only in the case of some official act directed to be performed in which obedience to the ordinance is involved.

It is next objected that the enforcing acts have legislated the United States out of South Carolina. I have already replied to this objection on another occasion, and will now but repeat what I then said: that they have been legislated out only to the extent that they had no right to enter. The Constitution has admitted the jurisdiction of the United States within the limits of the several states only so far as the delegated powers authorize; beyond that they are intruders, and may rightfully be expelled; and that they have been efficiently expelled by the legislation of the state through her civil process, as has been acknowledged on all sides in the debate, is only a confirmation of the truth of the doctrine for which the majority in Carolina have contended.

The very point at issue between the two parties there is, whether nullification is a peaceful and an efficient remedy against an unconstitutional act of the general government, and may be asserted, as such, through the state tribunals. Both parties agree that the acts against which it is directed are unconstitutional and oppressive. The controversy is only as to the means by which our citizens may be protected against the acknowledged encroachments on their rights. This being the point at issue between the parties, and the very object of the majority being an efficient protection of the citizens through the state tribunals, the measures adopted to enforce the ordinance of course received the most decisive character. We were not children, to act by halves. Yet for acting thus efficiently the state is denounced, and this bill reported, to overrule, by military force, the civil tribunal and civil process of the state! Sir, I consider this bill, and the arguments which have been urged on this floor in its support, as the most triumphant acknowledgment that nullification is peaceful and efficient, and so deeply intrenched in the principles of our system, that it cannot be assailed but by prostrating the Constitution, and substituting the supremacy of military force in lieu of the supremacy of the laws. In fact, the advocates of this bill refute their own argument. They tell us that

the ordinance is unconstitutional; that it infracts the Constitution of South Carolina, although, to me, the objection appears absurd, as it was adopted by the very authority which adopted the Constitution itself. They also tell us that the Supreme Court is the appointed arbiter of all controversies between a state and the general government. Why, then, do they not leave this controversy to that tribunal? Why do they not confide to them the abrogation of the ordinance, and the laws made in pursuance of it, and the assertion of that supremacy which they claim for the laws of Congress? The state stands pledged to resist no process of the court. Why, then, confer on the President the extensive and unlimited powers provided in this bill? Why authorize him to use military force to arrest the civil process of the state? But one answer can be given: That, in a contest between the state and the general government, if the resistance be limited on both sides to the civil process, the state, by its inherent sovereignty, standing upon its reserved powers, will prove too powerful in such a controversy, and must triumph over the Federal Government, sustained by its delegated and limited authority; and in this answer we have an acknowledgment of the truth of those great principles for which the state has so firmly and nobly contended.

Notwithstanding all that has been said, I may say that neither the senator from Delaware [Mr. Clayton], nor any other who has spoken on the same side, has directly and fairly met the great question at issue: Is this a federal union? a union of states, as distinct from that of individuals? Is the sovereignty in the several states, or in the American people in the aggregate? The very language which we are compelled to use when speaking of our political institutions affords proof conclusive as to its real character. The terms union, federal, united, all imply a combination of sovereignties, a confederation of states. They never apply to an association of individuals. Who ever heard of the United State of New York, of Massachusetts, or of Virginia? Who ever heard the term federal or union applied to the aggregation of individuals into one community? Nor is the other point less clear—that the sovereignty is in the several states, and that our system is a

union of twenty-four sovereign powers, under a constitutional compact, and not of a divided sovereignty between the states severally and the United States. In spite of all that has been said, I maintain that sovereignty is in its nature indivisible. It is the supreme power in a state, and we might just as well speak of half a square, or half a triangle, as of half a sovereignty. It is a gross error to confound the *exercise* of sovereign powers with *sovereignty* itself, or the *delegation* of such powers with the *surrender* of them. A sovereign may delegate his powers to be exercised by as many agents as he may think proper, under such conditions and with such limitations as he may impose; but to surrender any portion of his sovereignty to another is to annihilate the whole. The senator from Delaware [Mr. Clayton] calls this metaphysical reasoning, which he says he cannot comprehend. If by metaphysics he means that scholastic refinement which makes distinctions without difference, no one can hold it in more utter contempt than I do; but if, on the contrary, he means the power of analysis and combination—that power which reduces the most complex idea into its elements, which traces causes to their first principle, and, by the power of generalization and combination, unites the whole in one harmonious system—then, so far from deserving contempt, it is the highest attribute of the human mind. It is the power which raises man above the brute—which distinguishes his faculties from mere sagacity, which he holds in common with inferior animals. It is this power which has raised the astronomer from being a mere gazer at the stars to the high intellectual eminence of a Newton or a Laplace, and astronomy itself from a mere observation of insulated facts into that noble science which displays to our admiration the system of the universe. And shall this high power of the mind, which has effected such wonders when directed to the laws which control the material world, be forever prohibited, under a senseless cry of metaphysics, from being applied to the high purposes of political science and legislation? I hold them to be subject to laws as fixed as matter itself, and to be as fit a subject for the application of the highest intellectual power. Denunciation may, indeed, fall upon the philosophical inquirer into these first principles, as it did upon Galileo and Bacon, when they first

unfolded the great discoveries which have immortalized their names; but the time will come when truth will prevail in spite of prejudice and denunciation, and when politics and legislation will be considered as much a science as astronomy and chemistry.

In connection with this part of the subject, I understood the senator from Virginia [Mr. Rives] to say that sovereignty was divided, and that a portion remained with the states severally, and that the residue was vested in the Union. By Union, I suppose the senator meant the United States. If such be his meaning—if he intended to affirm that the sovereignty was in the twenty-four states, in whatever light he may view them, our opinions will not disagree; but according to my conception, the whole sovereignty is in the several states, while the exercise of sovereign power is divided—a part being exercised under compact through this general government, and the residue through the separate state governments. But if the senator from Virginia [Mr. Rives] means to assert that the twenty-four states form but one community, with a single sovereign power as to the objects of the Union, it will be but the revival of the old question, of whether the Union is a union between states as distinct communities, or a mere aggregate of the American people as a mass of individuals; and in this light his opinions would lead directly to consolidation.

Disguise it as you may, the controversy is one between power and liberty; and I tell the gentlemen who are opposed to me that, as strong as may be the love of power on their side, the love of liberty is still stronger on ours. History furnishes many instances of similar struggles, where the love of liberty has prevailed against power under every disadvantage, and among them few more striking than that of our own Revolution; where, as strong as was the parent country, and feeble as were the colonies, yet, under the impulse of liberty and the blessing of God, they gloriously triumphed in the contest. There are, indeed, many striking analogies between that and the present controversy. They both originated substantially in the same cause—with this difference: In the present case, the power of taxation is converted into that of regulating industry; in the other, the power of regulating industry, by the regulation of com-

merce, was attempted to be converted into the power of taxation. Were I to trace the analogy further, we should find that the perversion of the taxing power, in the one case, has given precisely the same control to the Northern section over the industry of the Southern section of the Union, which the power to regulate commerce gave to Great Britain over the industry of the colonies in the other; and that the very articles in which the colonies were permitted to have a free trade, and those in which the mother country had a monopoly, are almost identically the same as those in which the Southern States are permitted to have a free trade by the act of 1832, and in which the Northern States have, by the same act, secured a monopoly. The only difference is in the means. In the former, the colonies were permitted to have a free trade with all countries south of Cape Finisterre, a cape in the northern part of Spain; while north of that, the trade of the colonies was prohibited, except through the mother country, by means of her commercial regulations. If we compare the products of the country north and south of Cape Finisterre, we shall find them almost identical with the list of the protected and unprotected articles contained in the list of last year. Nor does the analogy terminate here. The very arguments resorted to at the commencement of the American Revolution, and the measures adopted, and the motives assigned to bring on that contest (to enforce the law), are almost identically the same.

But to return from this digression to the consideration of the bill. Whatever difference of opinion may exist upon other points, there is one on which I should suppose there can be none: that this bill rests upon principles which, if carried out, will ride over state sovereignties, and that it will be idle for any advocates hereafter to talk of state rights. The senator from Virginia [Mr. Rives] says that he is the advocate of state rights; but he must permit me to tell him that, although he may differ in premises from the other gentlemen with whom he acts on this occasion, yet, in supporting this bill, he obliterates every vestige of distinction between him and them, saving only that, professing the principles of '98, his example will be more pernicious than that of the most open and bitter opponent of the rights of

the states. I will also add, what I am compelled to say, that I must consider him [Mr. Rives] as less consistent than our old opponents, whose conclusions were fairly drawn from their premises, while his premises ought to have led him to opposite conclusions. The gentleman has told us that the new-fangled doctrines, as he chooses to call them, have brought state rights into disrepute. I must tell him, in reply, that what he calls new-fangled are but the doctrines of '98; and that it is he [Mr. Rives], and others with him, who, professing these doctrines, have degraded them by explaining away their meaning and efficacy. He [Mr. Rives] has disclaimed, in behalf of Virginia, the authorship of nullification. I will not dispute that point. If Virginia chooses to throw away one of her brightest ornaments, she must not hereafter complain that it has become the property of another. But while I have, as a representative of Carolina, no right to complain of the disavowal of the senator from Virginia, I must believe that he [Mr. Rives] has done his native state great injustice by declaring on this floor, that when she gravely resolved, in '98, that "in cases of deliberate and dangerous infractions of the Constitution, the states, as parties to the compact, have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose to arrest the progress of the evil, and to maintain within their respective limits the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them," she meant no more than to proclaim the right to protest and to remonstrate. To suppose that, in putting forth so solemn a declaration, which she afterward sustained by so able and elaborate an argument, she meant no more than to assert what no one had ever denied, would be to suppose that the state had been guilty of the most egregious trifling that ever was exhibited on so solemn an occasion.

GEORGE CANNING

THE FALL OF BONAPARTE

[George Canning, a famous British statesman and orator, was born in London in 1770. He took his degree at Oxford and entered the House of Commons in 1794 under the auspices of Pitt. His abilities won him important posts under the Pitt and the Portland ministries, and his eloquence supported the cause of Catholic Emancipation, but his most far-reaching influence was exerted in behalf of South America. He intervened with happy results between Portugal and Brazil, recognized, on behalf of Great Britain, the independence of the several South American republics, and, in his own famous phrase, "called the new world into existence to redress the balance of the old." The political principle thus embodied took subsequent shape in the Monroe Doctrine. Canning also prepared the way for the repeal of the corn laws, and was a friend of the Greek cause. He died in 1827. The brilliant speech here given was an expression of the triumph felt by the British people at Napoleon's downfall, and was delivered at Liverpool, 1814.]

GENTLEMEN: 'As your guest I thank you from my heart for the honorable and affectionate reception which you have given me. As the representative of Liverpool, I am most happy in meeting my constituents again, after a year's experience of each other and a year's separation; a year, the most eventful in the annals of the world, and comprising within itself such a series of stupendous changes as might have filled the history of an age.

Gentlemen, you have been so good as to couple with my name the expression of your acknowledgments for the attention which I have paid to the interests of your town. You, gentlemen, I have no doubt, recollect the terms upon which I entered into your service; and you are aware, therefore, that I claim no particular acknowledgment at your hands for attention to the interests of Liverpool, implicated as they are with the general interests of the country. I

trust, at the same time, that I have not been wanting to all or to any of you in matters of local or individual concern. But I should not do fairly by you, if I were not to take this opportunity of saying that a service (which certainly I will not pretend to describe as without some burden in itself) has been made light to me, beyond all example, by that institution which your munificence and provident care have established: I mean the office in London, through which your correspondence with your members is now carried on. I had no pretension, gentlemen, to this singular mark of your consideration; but neither will it, I hope, be thought presumptuous in me to confess that I might not have been able to discharge the service which I owe you, in a way which would have satisfied my own feelings as well as yours —that I might, in spite of all my endeavors, have been guilty of occasional omissions, if I had not been provided with some such medium of communication with my constituents. Of an absent and meritorious individual, it is as pleasing as it is just to speak well; and I do no more than justice to the gentleman [Mr. John Backhouse] whom you have appointed to conduct the office in question (with whom I had no previous acquaintance), in bearing public testimony to his merit, and in assuring you that it would be difficult to find any one who would surpass him in zeal, intelligence, and industry.

Having despatched what it was necessary for me to say on these points, I know, gentlemen, that it is your wish, and I feel it to be my duty, that I should now proceed to communicate to you my sentiments on the state of public affairs, with the same frankness which has hitherto distinguished all our intercourse with each other. That duty is one which it does not now require any effort of courage to perform. To exhort to sacrifices, to stimulate to exertion, to shame despondency, to divert from untimely concession, is a duty of a sterner sort, which you found me not backward to discharge, at a period when, from the shortness of our acquaintance, I was uncertain whether my freedom might not offend you. My task of to-day is one at which no man can take offense. It is to mingle my congratulations with your rejoicings on the events which have passed and are passing in the world.

If, in contemplating events so widely (I had almost said so tremendously) important, it be pardonable to turn one's view for a moment to local and partial considerations, I may be permitted to observe that, while to Great Britain, while to all Europe, while to the world and to posterity, the events which have recently taken place are matter of unbounded and universal joy, there is no collection of individuals who are better entitled than the company now assembled in this room (in great part, I presume, identically the same, and altogether representing the same interests and feelings as that of which I took leave, in this room, about fourteen months ago) to exult in the present state of things, and to derive from it, in addition to their share of the general joy, a distinct and special satisfaction.

We cannot forget, gentlemen, the sinister omens and awful predictions under which we met and parted in October, 1812. The penalty denounced upon you for your election of me was embarrassment to the rich and famine to the poor. I was warned that, when I should return to renew my acquaintance with my constituents, I should find the grass growing in your streets. In spite of that denunciation, you did me the honor to elect me; in spite of that warning, I venture to meet you here again. It must be fairly confessed that this is not the season of the year to estimate correctly the amount of superfluous and unprofitable vegetation with which your streets may be teeming; but, without presuming to limit the power of productive nature, it is at least satisfactory to know that the fields have not been starved to clothe your quays with verdure; that it is not by economizing in the scantiness of the harvest that Nature has reserved her vigor for the pastures of your exchange.

But, gentlemen, I am sure you feel, with me, that these are topics which I treat with levity only because they are not, nor were, at the time when they were seriously urged, susceptible of a serious argument; they did not furnish grounds on which any man would rest his appeal to your favor, or on which your choice of any man could be justified. If I have condescended to revert to them at all, it is because I would leave none of those recollections untouched which the comparison of our last meeting with the present,

I know, suggests to your minds as well as my own; and because I would, so far as in me lies, endeavor to banish from all future use, by exposing their absurdity, topics which are calculated only to mislead and to inflame. That the seasons would have run their appointed course, that the sun would have shone with as genial a warmth, and the showers would have fallen with as fertilizing a moisture, if you had not chosen me for your representative, is an admission which I make without much apprehension of the consequence. Nor do I wish you to believe that your choice of any other than me would have delayed the return of your prosperity, or prevented the revival of your commerce.

I make these admissions without fear, so far as concerns the choice between individuals. But I do not admit that it was equally indifferent upon what principles that choice should be determined. I do not admit that if the principles which it was then recommended to you to countenance had unfortunately prevailed in Parliament, and, through the authority of Parliament, had been introduced into the counsels of the country, they would not have interfered with fatal operation, not indeed to arrest the bounty of Providence, to turn back the course of the seasons, and to blast the fertility of the earth, but to stop that current of political events which, "taken at the flood," has placed England at the head of the world.

Gentlemen, if I had met you here again on this day in a state of public affairs as doubtful as that in which we took leave of each other; if confederated nations had been still arrayed against this country, and the balance of Europe still trembling in the scale, I should not have hesitated now, as I did not hesitate then, to declare my decided and unalterable opinion, that perseverance, under whatever difficulties, under whatever privations, afforded the only chance of prosperity to you because the only chance of safety to your country, and the only chance of safety to the country because the only chance of deliverance to Europe. Gentlemen, I should be ashamed to address you now in the tone of triumph, if I had not addressed you then in that of exhortation. I should be ashamed to appear before you shouting in the train of success, if I had not looked you in the face

and encouraged you to patience under difficulties. It is because my acquaintance with you commenced in times of peril and embarrassment, and because I then neither flattered nor deceived you, that I now not only offer to you my congratulations, but put in my claim to yours, on the extinction of that peril, on the termination of that embarrassment, and on the glorious issue to which exertion and endurance have brought that great struggle in which our honor and our happiness were involved.

Gentlemen, during the course of a political life, nearly coeval with the commencement of the war, I have never given one vote, I have never uttered one sentiment, which had not for its object the consummation now happily within our view.

I am not ashamed, and it is not unpleasing or unprofitable, to look back upon the dangers which we have passed, and to compare them with the scene which now lies before us. We behold a country inferior in population to most of her continental neighbors, but multiplying her faculties and resources by her own activity and enterprise, by the vigor of her constitution, and by the good sense of her people; we behold her, after standing up against a formidable foe throughout a contest, in the course of which every one of her allies, and at times all of them together, have fainted and failed—nay, have been driven to combine with the enemy against her—we behold her, at this moment, rallying the nations of Europe to one point, and leading them to decisive victory.

If such a picture were merely the bright vision of speculative philosophy, if it were presented to us in the page of the history of ancient times, it would stir and warm the heart. But, gentlemen, this country is our own; and what must be the feelings which arise, on such a review, in the bosom of every son of that country? What must be the feelings of a community such as I am now addressing, which constitutes no insignificant part of the strength of the nation so described; which has suffered largely in her privations, and may hope to participate proportionably in her reward? What (I may be permitted to add) must be the feelings of one who is chosen to represent that community, and who finds himself in that honorable station at the

moment of triumph, only because he discountenanced despair in a moment of despondency?

From the contemplation of a spectacle so mighty and magnificent as this, I should disdain to turn aside to the controversies of party. Of principles, however, it is impossible not to say something; because our triumph would be incomplete, and its blessings might be transient, if we could be led astray by any sophistry; if we could consent, in a sort of compromise of common joy, to forget or to misstate the causes from which that triumph has sprung. All of one mind I trust and believe we are, in exulting at the success of our country; all of one mind, I trust, we now are throughout this land, in determining to persevere if need be in strenuous exertion to prosecute, and, I hope, to perfect the great work so happily in progress. But we know that there are some of those who share most heartily in the public exultation, who yet ascribe effects, which happily cannot be disputed, to causes which may justly be denied. No tenderness for disappointed prophecies, gentlemen, ought to induce us thus to disconnect effect and cause. It would lead to errors which might be dangerous, if unwarily adopted and generally received.

We have heard, for instance, that the war has now been successful, because the principles on which the war was undertaken have been renounced; that we are at length blessed with victory, because we have thrown away the banner under which we entered into the contest; that the contest was commenced with one set of principles, but that the issue has been happily brought about by the adoption of another. Gentlemen, I know of no such change. If we have succeeded, it has not been by the renunciation, but by the prosecution of our principles; if we have succeeded, it has not been by adopting new maxims of policy, but by upholding, under all varieties of difficulty and discouragement, old, established, inviolable principles of conduct.

We are told that this war has of late become *a war of the people*, and that by the operation of that change alone the power of imperial France has been baffled and overcome. Nations, it is said, have at length made common cause with their sovereigns, in a contest which heretofore had been a contest of sovereigns only. Gentlemen, the

96262

fact of the change might be admitted, without therefore admitting the argument. It does not follow that the people were not at all times equally interested in the war (as those who think as I do have always contended that they were), because it may be and must be admitted that the people in many countries were for a time deluded. They who argue against us say that jarring interests have been reconciled. We say that gross delusions have been removed. Both admit the fact that sovereigns and their people *are* identified. But it is for them who contend that this has been effected by change of principles to specify the change. What change of principles or of government has taken place among the nations of Europe? We are the best judges of ourselves—what change has taken place *here?* Is the constitution other than it was when we were told (as we often were told in the bad times) that it was a doubt whether it were worth defending? Is the constitution other than it was when we were warned that peace on any terms must be made, as the only hope of saving it from popular indignation and popular reform?

There is yet another question to be asked. By what power, in what part of the world, has that final blow been struck which has smitten the tyrant to the ground? I suppose, by some enlightened republic; by some recently regenerated government of pure philanthropy and uncorrupted virtue; I suppose, by some nation which, in the excess of popular freedom, considers even a representative system as defective, unless each individual interferes directly in the national concerns; some nation of enlightened patriots, every man of whom is a politician in the coffee-house, as well as in the senate; I suppose it is from some such government as this that the conqueror of autocrats, the sworn destroyer of monarchical England, has met his doom. I look through the European world, gentlemen, in vain; I find there no such august community. But in another hemisphere I do find such a one, which, no doubt, must be the political David by whom the Goliath of Europe has been brought down. What is the name of that glorious republic, to which the gratitude of Europe is eternally due—which, from its innate hatred to tyranny, has so perseveringly exerted itself to liberate the world, and at last

has successfully closed the contest? Alas, gentlemen, such a republic I do indeed find; and I find it enlisted, and (God be thanked!) enlisted alone, under the banner of the despot. But where was the blow struck? Where? Alas for theory! In the wilds of despotic Russia. It was followed up on the plains of Leipsic—by Russian, Prussian, and Austrian arms.

But let me not be mistaken. Do I, therefore, mean to contend—do I, therefore, give to our antagonists in the argument the advantage of ascribing to us the base tenet that an absolute monarchy is better than a free government? God forbid! What I mean is this, that, in appreciating the comparative excellence of political institutions, in estimating the force of national spirit and the impulse of national feeling, it is idle, it is mere pedantry, to overlook the affections of nature. The order of nature could not subsist among mankind if there were not an *instinctive* patriotism, I do not say unconnected with, but prior and paramount to, the desire of political amelioration. It may be very wrong that it should be so. I cannot help it. Our business is with fact. And surely it is not to be regretted that tyrants and conquerors should have learned, from the lessons of experience, that the first consideration suggested to the inhabitants of any country by a foreign invasion is not whether the political constitution of the state be faultlessly perfect or not, but whether the altar at which he has worshiped—whether the home in which he has dwelt from his infancy—whether his wife and his children—whether the tombs of his forefathers—whether the place of the sovereign under whom he was born, and to whom he therefore owes (or, if it must be so stated, fancies that he therefore owes) allegiance—shall be abandoned to violence and profanation.

That, in the infancy of the French Revolution, many nations in Europe were, unfortunately, led to believe and to act upon a different persuasion is undoubtedly true; that whole countries were overrun by reforming conquerors, and flattered themselves with being proselytes till they found themselves victims. Even in this country, as I have already said, there have been times when we have been called upon to consider whether there was not something at home which must be mended before we could hope to repel a foreign invader with success.

It is fortunate for the world that this question should have been tried, if I may so say, to a disadvantage; that it should have been tried in countries where no man in his senses will say that the frame of political society is such as, according to the most moderate principles of regulated freedom, it ought to be; where, I will venture to say, without hazarding the imputation of being myself a visionary reformer, political society is not such as, after the successes of this war, and from the happy contagion of the example of Great Britain, it is sure gradually to become. It is fortunate for the world that this question should have been tried on its own merits; that, after twenty years of controversy, we should be authorized, by undoubted results, to revert to nature and to truth, and to disentangle the genuine feelings of the heart from the obstructions which a cold, presumptuous, generalizing philosophy had wound around them.

One of the most delightful poets of this country, in describing the various proportions of natural blessings and advantages dispensed by Providence to the various nations of Europe, turns from the luxuriant plains and cloudless skies of Italy to the rugged mountains of Switzerland, and inquires whether there, also, in those barren and stormy regions, the "patriot passion" is found equally imprinted on the heart? He decides the question truly in the affirmative, and he says of the inhabitants of those bleak wilds:—

> "Dear is that shed to which his soul conforms,
> And dear that hill which lifts him to the storms;
> And, as a child, when scaring sounds molest,
> Clings close and closer to the mother's breast,
> So the loud torrent and the whirlwind's roar,
> But bind him to his native mountains more."

What Goldsmith has thus beautifully applied to the physical varieties of soil and climate has been found no less true with respect to political institutions. A sober desire of improvement, a rational endeavor to redress error and to correct imperfection in the political frame of human society, are not only natural, but laudable in man. But it is well that it should have been shown, by irrefragable

proof, that these sentiments, even where most strongly and most justly felt, supersede not that devotion to native soil which is the foundation of national independence. And it is right that it should be understood and remembered, that the spirit of national independence alone, aroused where it had slumbered, enlightened where it had been deluded, and kindled into enthusiasm by the insults and outrages of an all-grasping invader, has been found sufficient, without internal changes and compromises of sovereigns or governments with their people—without relaxation of allegiance and abjurations of authority, to animate, as with one pervading soul, the different nations of the continent; to combine, as into one congenial mass, their various feelings, passions, prejudices; to direct these concentrated energies with one impulse against the common tyrant; and to shake (and, may we not hope? to overthrow) the *Babel* of his iniquitous power.

Gentlemen, there is another argument, more peculiarly relating to our own country, which has at times been interposed to discourage the prosecution of the war.

That this country is sufficient to its own defense, sufficient to its own happiness, sufficient to its own independence; and that the complicated combinations of continental policy are always hazardous to our interests, as well as burdensome to our means, has been, at several periods of the war, a favorite doctrine, not only with those who, for other reasons, wished to embarrass the measures of the government, but with men of the most enlightened minds, of the most benevolent views, and the most ardent zeal for the interests as well as the honor of their country. May we not flatter ourselves that upon this point, also, experience has decided in favor of the course of policy which has been actually pursued?

Can any man now look back upon the trial which we have gone through, and maintain that, at any period during the last twenty years, the plan of insulated policy could have been adopted, without having in the event, at this day, prostrated England at the foot of a conqueror? Great, indeed, has been the call upon our exertions; great, indeed, has been the drain upon our resources; long and wearisome has the struggle been; and late is the moment at which

peace is brought within our reach. But even though the difficulties of the contest may have been enhanced, and its duration protracted by it, yet is there any man who seriously doubts whether the having associated our destinies with the destinies of other nations be or be not that which, under the blessing of Providence, has eventually secured the safety of all?

It is at the moment when such a trial has come to its issue, that it is fair to ask of those who have suffered under the pressure of protracted exertion (and of whom rather than of those who are assembled around me—for by whom have such privations been felt more sensibly?)—it is now, I say, the time to ask whether, at any former period of the contest, such a peace could have been made as would at once have guarded the national interests and corresponded with the national character. I address myself now to such persons only as think the character of a nation an essential part of its strength, and consequently of its safety. But if, among persons of that description, there be one who, with all his zeal for the glory of his country, has yet at times been willing to abandon the contest in mere weariness and despair, of such a man I would ask, whether he can indicate the period at which he now wishes that such an abandonment had been consented to by the Government and the Parliament of Great Britain.

Is it when the continent was at peace—when, looking upon the map of Europe, you saw one mighty and connected system, one great luminary, with his attendant satellites circulating around him; at that period could this country have made peace, and have remained at peace for a twelvemonth? What is the answer? Why, that the experiment was tried. The result was the renewal of the war.

Was it at a later period, when the continental system had been established? When two-thirds of the ports of Europe were shut against you? When but a single link was wanting to bind the continent in a circling chain of iron, which should exclude you from intercourse with other nations? At that moment peace was most earnestly recommended to you. At that moment, gentlemen, I first came among you. At that moment I ventured to recommend to you perseverance, patient perseverance; and to express

a hope that, by the mere strain of an unnatural effort, the massive bonds imposed upon the nations of the continent might, at no distant period, burst asunder. I was heard by you with indulgence—I know not whether with conviction. But is it now to be regretted that we did not at that moment yield to the pressure of our wants or of our fears? What has been the issue? The continental system was completed, with the sole exception of Russia, in the year 1812. In that year the pressure upon this country was undoubtedly painful. Had we yielded, the system would have been immortal. We persevered, and, before the conclusion of another year, the system was at an end: at an end, as all schemes of violence naturally terminate, not by a mild and gradual decay, such as waits upon a regular and well-spent life, but by sudden dissolution; at an end, like the breaking up of a winter's frost. But yesterday the whole continent, like a mighty plain covered with one mass of ice, presented to the view a drear expanse of barren uniformity; to-day, the breath of heaven unbinds the earth, the streams begin to flow again, and the intercourse of human kind revives.

Can we regret that we did not, like the fainting traveler, lie down to rest—but, indeed, to perish—under the severity of that inclement season? Did we not more wisely to bear up, and to wait the change?

Gentlemen, I have said that I should be ashamed, and in truth I should be so, to address you in the language of exultation, if it were merely for the indulgence, however legitimate, of an exuberant and ungovernable joy. But they who have suffered great privations have a claim not merely to consolation, but to something more. They are justly to be compensated for what they have undergone, or lost, or hazarded, by the contemplation of what they have gained.

We have gained, then, a rank and authority in Europe, such as, for the life of the longest liver of those who now hear me, must place this country upon an eminence which no probable reverses can shake. We have gained, or rather we have recovered, a splendor of military glory, which places us by the side of the greatest military nations in the world. At the beginning of this war, while there was not

a British bosom that did not beat with rapture at the exploits of our navy, there were few who would not have been contented to compromise for that reputation alone; to claim the sea as exclusively our province, and to leave to France and the other continental powers the struggle for superiority by land. That fabled deity, whom I see portrayed upon the wall,* was considered as the exclusive patron of British prowess in battle; but in seeming accordance with the beautiful fiction of ancient mythology, our Neptune, in the heat of contest, smote the earth with his trident, and up sprang the fiery war horse, the emblem of military power.

Let Portugal, now led to the pursuit of her flying conquerors—let liberated Spain—let France, invaded in her turn by those whom she had overrun or menaced with invasion, attest the triumphs of the army of Great Britain, and the equality of her military with her naval fame. And let those who, even after the triumphs of the Peninsula had begun, while they admitted that we had, indeed, wounded the giant in the heel, still deemed the rest of his huge frame invulnerable—let them now behold him reeling under the blows of united nations, and acknowledge at once the might of British arms and the force of British example.

I do not say that these are considerations with a view to which the war, if otherwise terminable, ought to have been purposely protracted; but I say that, upon the retrospect, we have good reason to rejoice that the war was not closed ingloriously and insecurely, when the latter events of it have been such as have established our security by our glory.

I say we have reason to rejoice that, during the period when the continent was prostrate before France—that, especially during the period when the continental system was in force, we did not shrink from the struggle; that we did not make peace for present and momentary ease, unmindful of the permanent safety and greatness of this country; that we did not leave unsolved the momentous questions, whether this country could maintain itself against France, unaided and alone; or with the continent divided; or with the continent combined against it; whether, when the

* A figure of Neptune.

wrath of the tyrant of the European world was kindled against us with sevenfold fury, we could or could not walk unharmed and unfettered through the flames.

I say we have reason to rejoice that, throughout this more than *Punic* war, in which it has so often been the pride of our enemy to represent herself as the Rome, and England as the Carthage, of modern times (with at least this color for the comparison, that the utter destruction of the modern Carthage has uniformly been proclaimed to be indispensable to the greatness of her rival), we have, I say, reason to rejoice that, unlike our assigned prototype, we have not been diverted by internal dissensions from the vigorous support of a vital struggle; that we have not suffered distress nor clamor to distract our counsels, or to check the exertions of our arms.

Gentlemen, for twenty years that I have sat in Parliament, I have been an advocate of the war. You knew this when you did me the honor to choose me as your representative. I then told you that I was the advocate of the war, because I was a lover of peace; but of a peace that should be the fruit of honorable exertion—a peace that should have a character of dignity—a peace that should be worth preserving, and should be likely to endure. I confess I was not sanguine enough, at that time, to hope that I should so soon have an opportunity of justifying my professions. But I know not why, six weeks hence, such a peace should not be made as England may not only be glad, but proud to ratify. Not such a peace, gentlemen, as that of Amiens—a short and feverish interval of unrefreshing repose. During that peace, which of you went or sent a son to Paris, who did not feel or learn that an Englishman appeared in France shorn of the dignity of his country; with the mien of a suppliant, and the conscious prostration of a man who had consented to purchase his gain or his ease by submission? But let a peace be made to-morrow, such as the allies have now the power to dictate, and the meanest of the subjects of this kingdom shall not walk the streets of Paris without being pointed out as the compatriot of Wellington; as one of that nation whose firmness and perseverance have humbled France and rescued Europe.

Is there any man that has a heart in his bosom who does not find, in the contemplation of this contrast alone, a recompense for the struggles and the sufferings of years?

But, gentlemen, the doing right is not only the most honorable course of action—it is also the most profitable in its results. At any former period of the war, the independence of almost all the other countries, our allies, would have been to be purchased with sacrifices profusely poured out from the lap of British victory. Not a throne to be reestablished, not a province to be evacuated, not a garrison to be withdrawn, but this country would have had to make compensation out of her conquests for the concessions obtained from the enemy. Now, happily, this work is already done, either by our efforts or to our hands. The Peninsula free—the lawful commonwealth of European states already, in a great measure, restored, Great Britain may now appear in the congress of the world, rich in conquests, nobly and rightfully won, with little claim upon her faith or her justice, whatever may be the spontaneous impulse of her generosity or her moderation.

Such, gentlemen, is the situation and prospect of affairs at the moment at which I have the honor to address you. That you, gentlemen, may have your full share in the prosperity of your country is my sincere and earnest wish. The courage with which you bore up in adverse circumstances eminently entitles you to this reward.

For myself, gentlemen, while I rejoice in your returning prosperity, I rejoice also that our connection began under auspices so much less favorable; that we had an opportunity of knowing each other's minds in times when the minds of men are brought to the proof—times of trial and difficulty. I had the satisfaction of avowing to you, and you the candor and magnanimity to approve, the principles and opinions by which my public conduct has uniformly been guided, at a period when the soundness of those opinions and the application of those principles was matter of doubt and controversy. I thought, and I said, at the time of our first meeting, that the cause of England and of civilized Europe must be ultimately triumphant, if we but preserved our spirit untainted and our constancy unshaken. Such an assertion was, at that time, the object of ridicule

with many persons: a single year has elapsed, and it is now the voice of the whole world.

Gentlemen, we may, therefore, confidently indulge the hope that our opinions will continue in unison; that our concurrence will be as cordial as it has hitherto been, if unhappily any new occasion of difficulty or embarrassment should hereafter arise.

At the present moment, I am sure, we are equally desirous to bury the recollection of all our differences with others in that general feeling of exultation in which all opinions happily combine.

LAZARE NICOLAS MARGUERITE CARNOT

AGAINST IMPERIALISM IN FRANCE

[Lazare Nicolas Marguerite Carnot, a French statesman and military leader, and one of the greatest patriots of the first revolutionary period, was born in 1753. He received a soldier's education and entered the army. Upon the outbreak of the great French revolution, Carnot adopted its principles with enthusiasm. He was elected to the various representative bodies that directed the revolution, and upon the trial of Louis XVI. voted for the death of that king. Next he was placed at the head of military affairs. He obtained and retained the control of military affairs when the Directory was established, and continued as before to hold a seat in the national legislative body. He had to retire to Germany when accused of monarchical sentiments. When France was threatened by invasion, Carnot offered his services to Napoleon's government. This led to his being proscribed at the restoration, and he died in exile in 1823. The speech that follows was a vigorous protest against the establishing of imperial government in France, and was delivered in the National Assembly in 1812.]

FELLOW CITIZENS: Among the orators who have preceded me, and who have all touched on the motion of our colleague Curée, several have anticipated the objections that might be made to it, and have responded with as much talent as amenity; they have given an example of a moderation which I shall endeavor to imitate by proposing a few ideas which have apparently escaped them. And as to those whom I oppose, and thus render myself liable to that suspicion that my motives are merely personal, whoever would attribute such to me are ignorant of the character of a man entirely devoted to his country. In reply, I ask them to examine carefully my political conduct since the commencement of the revolution, and all the record of my private life.

I am far from desiring to diminish the praises accorded the first consul; if we owed him but the code civil, his name would worthily be immortalized to posterity. But whatever the services a citizen has rendered his country, he must expect honors but in the extent of the national recognition of his work. If the citizen has restored public liberty, if he has been a benefactor to his country, would it be a proper recompense to offer him the sacrifice of that liberty? Nay! Would it not be an annulment of his own work to convert that country into his private patrimony?

From the very moment it was proposed to the French people to vote to make the consulate an office for life, each easily judged there was a mental reservation, and saw the ulterior purpose and end of the proposal. In effect, there was seen the rapid succession of a series of institutions evidently monarchical; but at each move anxiety was manifested to reassure disturbed and inquiring spirits on the score of liberty, that these new institutions and arrangements were conceived only to procure the highest protection that could be desired for liberty.

To-day is uncovered and developed in the most positive manner the meaning of so many of these preliminary measures. We are asked to declare ourselves upon a formal proposition to reestablish the monarchical system, and to confer an imperial and hereditary dignity on the first consul.

At that time I voted against a life consulate; I shall vote now against any reestablishment of a monarchy, as I believe it my duty to do. But it was done with no desire to evoke partisanship; without personal feeling; without any sentiment save a passion for the public good, which always impels me to the defense of the popular cause.

I always fully submit to existing laws, even when they are most displeasing. More than once I have been a victim to my devotion to law, and I shall not begin to retrograde to-day. I declare, therefore, that while I combat this proposition, from the moment that a new order of things shall have been established, which shall have received the assent of the mass of our citizens, I shall be first to conform my actions; to give to the supreme authority all the marks of deference commanded by the constitutional oligarchy.

Can every member of society record a vow as sincere and disinterested as my own?

I shall not force into the discussion my preference for the general merits of any one system of government over another. On these subjects there are numberless volumes written. I shall charge myself with examining in few words, and in the simplest terms, the particular case in which present circumstances place us. All the arguments thus far made for the reestablishment of monarchy in France are reduced to the statement that it is the only method of assuring the stability of the government and the public tranquillity, the only escape from internal disorder, the sole bond of union against external enemies, that the republican system has been vainly essayed in all possible manners; and that from all these efforts only anarchy has resulted. A prolonged and ceaseless revolution has reawakened a perpetual fear of new disorders, and consequently a deep and universal desire to see reestablished the old hereditary government, changing only the dynasty. To this we must make reply.

I remark here that the government of a single person is no assurance of a stable and tranquil government. The duration of the Roman empire was no longer than that of the Roman republic. Their internecine troubles were greater, their crimes more multiplied. The pride of republicanism, the heroism, and the masculine virtues were replaced by the most ridiculous vanity, the vilest adulation, the boldest cupidity, the most absolute indifference to the national prosperity. Where was any remedy in the heredity of the throne? Was it not regarded as the legitimate heritage of the house of Augustus? Was a Domitian not the son of Vespasian, a Caligula the son of Germanicus, a Commodus the son of Marcus Aurelius? In France, it is true, the last dynasty maintained itself for eight hundred years, but were the people any the less tormented? What have been the internal dissensions? What the foreign wars undertaken for pretensions and rights of succession, which gave birth to the alliances of this dynasty with foreign nations? From the moment that a nation espouses the particular interests of one family, she is compelled to intervene in a multitude of matters which but for this would be

to her of uttermost indifference. We have hardly succeeded in establishing a republic among us, notwithstanding that we have essayed it under various forms, more or less democratic. . . .

After the peace of Amiens, Napoleon had choice between the republican and monarchical systems; he could do as he pleased. He would have met but the slightest opposition. The citadel of liberty was confided to him; he swore to defend it; and, holding his promise, he should have fulfilled the desire of the nation which judged him alone capable of solving the grand problem of public liberty in its vast extent. He might have covered himself with an incomparable glory. Instead of that, what is being done to-day? They propose to make for him an absolute and hereditary property of a great power of which he was made the administrator. Is this the real desire and to the real interest of the first consul himself? I do not believe it.

It is true the state was falling into dissolution, and that absolutism pulled it from the edge of the abyss. But what do we conclude from that? What all the world knows—that political bodies are subject to affections which can be cured but by violent remedies; that sometimes a dictator is necessary for a moment to save liberty. The Romans, who were so jealous of it, nevertheless recognized the necessity of this supreme power at intervals. But because a violent remedy has saved a patient, must there be a daily administration of violent remedies? Fabius, Cincinnatus, Camillus saved Rome by the exercise of absolute power, but they relinquished this power as soon as practicable; they would have killed Rome had they continued to wield it. Cæsar was the first who desired to keep this power: he became its victim, but liberty was lost for futurity. Thus everything that has ever been said up to this date on absolute government proves only the necessity for temporary dictatorships in crises of the state, but not the establishment of a permanent and irresponsible power.

It is not from the character of their government that great republics have lacked stability; it is because, having been born in the breasts of storms, it is always in a state of exaltation that they are established. One only was the labor of philosophy, organized calmly. That republic, the

United States of America, full of wisdom and of strength, exhibits this phenomenon, and each day their prosperity shows an increase which astonishes other nations. Thus it was reserved for the New World to teach the Old that existence is possible and peaceable under the rule of liberty and equality. Yes, I state this proposition, that when a new order of things can be established without fearing partisan influences, as the first consul has done, principally after the peace of Amiens, and as he can still do, it becomes much easier to form a republic without anarchy than a monarchy without despotism. For how can we conceive a limitation which would not be illusory in a government of which the chief had all the executive power in his hand and all the places to bestow?

They have spoken of institutions to produce all these good effects. But before we propose to establish a monarchy, should we not first assure ourselves and demonstrate to those who are to vote on the question, that these institutions proposed are in the order of possible things, and not metaphysical obstructions, which have been held a reproach to the opposite system? Up to this moment nothing has been successfully invented to curb supreme power but what are called intermediary bodies or privileges. Is it, then, of a new nobility you would speak when you allude to institutions? But such remedies—are they not worse than the disease? For the absolute power of a monarch takes but our liberty, while the institution of privileged classes robs us at the same time of our liberty and our equality. And if even at the commencement dignities and ranks were but personal, we know they would finish always as the fiefs of other times, in becoming hereditary.

To these general principles I shall add a few special observations. I assume that all the French give assent to these proposed changes; but it will be the real free will and wish of Frenchmen which is produced from a register where each is obliged to individually sign his vote. Who does not know what is the influence in similar cases of the presiding authority? From all parties in France, it would be said, springs a universal desire of the citizens for the reestablishment of the hereditary monarchy; but can we not look suspiciously on an opinion, concentrated thus far

almost exclusively among public functionaries, when we consider the inconvenience they would have to manifest any contrary opinion; when we know that the liberty of the press is so enfeebled that it is not possible to insert in any journal the most moderate and respectful protests?

Doubtless there will be no making any choice of the hereditary chief, if they declare it necessary to have one.

Is it hoped, in raising this new dynasty, to hasten the period of general peace? Will it not rather be a new obstacle? Are we assured that the other great powers of Europe will assent to this new title? And if they do not, do we take up arms to constrain them? Or after having sunk the title of first consul in that of emperor, will he be content to remain first consul to the rest of Europe while he is emperor only to Frenchmen, or shall we compromise by a vain title the security and the prosperity of the entire nation?

It appears, therefore, infinitely doubtful if the new order of things can give us the stability of the present state. There is for the government one method of consolidation and strength. It is to be just; that no favoritism or bias be of avail to influence its services; that there be a guaranty against robbery and fraud. It is far from me to desire to make any particular application of my language or to criticize the conduct of the government. It is against arbitrary power itself I appeal, and not against those in whose hands this power may reside. Has liberty then been shown to man that he shall never enjoy it? Shall it always be held to his gaze as a fruit, that when he extends the hand to grasp he must be stricken with death? And Nature, which has made liberty such a pressing need to us, does she really desire to betray our confidence? No! I shall never believe this good, so universally preferred to all others—without which all others are nothing—is a simple illusion. My heart tells me that liberty is possible, that its régime is easier and more stable than any arbitrary government, than any oligarchy.

But, nevertheless (I repeat it), I shall be always ready to sacrifice my dearest affections to the interest of our common country; I shall be satisfied to have once more caused to be heard the accents of an independent mind; and my respect for the law will be so much the more sure, as it is

the fruit of long misfortunes, and of this reason, which commands us imperiously at this day to reunite as one body against the implacable enemy of one party as well as the other—of this enemy, which is always ready to foment discord, and to whom all means are lawful provided he can attain his end, namely—universal oppression and tyranny over the whole extent of the ocean.

I vote against the proposition.

EMILIO CASTELAR

A PLEA FOR REPUBLICAN INSTITUTIONS

[Emilio Castelar, a Spanish statesman, orator, and writer, was born in Cadiz in 1832. He received a legal education and entered journalism, his sympathies in public affairs being from the beginning with the popular party. Appointed a professor in the University of Madrid, he acquired great influence over the youth of Spain by his writings at first and later by his eloquence. The prominent part he took in the Spanish uprising in 1866 forced him to leave the country, but the revolution two years later enabled him to return. He was now the recognized head of the Spanish republican movement, being made minister of foreign affairs and later (1873–1874) president, with dictatorial powers. The republican government was unable to survive Castelar's resignation of office, however, and when monarchy was restored he retired to private life. His later years were devoted to literature and occasional public activities, and under Alfonso XII. he was even elected to the Cortes. Among his works may be mentioned "History of the Republican Movement in Europe," "Historical Studies of the Middle Ages," and several volumes of addresses and speeches. He died in 1899. The first speech following was made in the Cortes in 1869; the second, also in the Cortes, in 1870.]

BEFORE replying to Minister Sagasta's speech of last Saturday, I desire to say that my public life forbids me to defend myself against personal attacks such as the gentleman seems to delight in. The minister of government was extremely kind in speaking of my address as a brilliant one, and extremely severe when he declared that it was wanting in truth. Neither criticism was just. Gentlemen, I would not have to defend my own speeches if they had the resplendency and the beauty attributed to them by Mr. Sagasta. I would be content to let them shine, confident, with the most eloquent and greatest of ancient philosophers, that "beauty is the resplendency of truth." After all, if there is any grand quality in this assembly it is

eloquence, the expressing of grand sentiments and sublime ideas in fervent language. I have heard such speeches come from every side of the assembly, and I would like to hear one, in the language of moderation, from the government. Discussions carried on in that manner, with eloquence and good judgment, give us hope for the future, for the laws of history do not permit a dictatorship to fasten itself upon a people whose faces are lighted by the fires of eloquence—a sure sign of grand apostolic work in social life.

I have said this, not being able to proceed without repelling a calumnious imputation directed against me by the minister of government. To a question of Mr. Oria relative to an attack on property, the gentleman replied that it was the work of the Federalists. In what article, in what proclamation, in what program, in what bulletin, in what periodical, in what speech of a Federalist has the gentleman discovered that we attack property? Against the robbers are the courts and the judges, and it is an imposition on the assembly and a calumny on our social conditions to charge us with such crimes and to seek to spatter this minority with the mud that bespatters all of you. This is not just.

Now, I must answer with calmness another slanderous imputation. The minister of government says that the Federal Republican party desired the dismemberment, the dissolution, the breaking up of this country. A party that aspires to a European confederation, a party that desires to see the abominable word "war" abolished, a party that desires to unite disunited people, cannot seek the dismemberment of a country bound together by tradition and law. We desire that from Barcelona to Lisbon, from Irun to Cadiz, there shall be but one flag—a flag, however, under whose folds the citizen may have freedom, the municipality autonomy, and the province rights that belong to the whole country. The accusation of the gentleman reminds me of the one concerning decentralization made by the Moderate party against the Progressive party, and the claim of the Moderates that with decentralization national unity was impossible. Notwithstanding this claim, it is generally believed to-day that people who suffer most in their independence have a centralized government, because it is enough to aim a blow at their head, like the blow aimed by

the allied powers in Paris in 1815. The belief is general that those nations that have great internal dissensions are centralized nations, because they have an apoplectic head on a weak, stiff body. And so I say that, as centralization is believed in to-day, federation will be to-morrow—a federation the belief in which will result sooner or later in the organization of the United States of Spain within the United States of Europe.

Mr. Sagasta began to defend the dictatorship, and in defending it he drew an awful picture of our social condition, talking of crimes and criminals, and telling you that our education in the past was very bad, and that the corruption of to-day is very great. And what have the republicans to see from that? For three centuries, yes, more than three centuries, our church has been as an enemy to the human conscience. For many centuries it has been inimical to the national will. Consequently, if there is anything very bad or vicious here to-day, it is owing to institutions with which we have nothing to do. And more, this evil, this viciousness, owe their existence to a lack of respect among the people for the law. And this lack of respect for the law is born of the systematic abuse of power by our arbitrary government. Judges nominated by a party and appointed to revise the electoral lists; schools, so called, for filling convents and military barracks; the jury outlawed; public life closed to the democracy; political corruption extending from above down in all directions—this is the product, and these the products, of the sore and wounded people painted by Mr. Sagasta; people who are the natural offspring of a long heredity of crime and error. It is impossible to cure the people if the system is not changed. . . .

Well, deputies, what form of government has come to Spain since the September revolution? The republican form has come and is still here. It so happens that you have not been able yet to implant monarchical institutions in its place. After having been fifteen days in power you declared yourselves for the monarchy. Did the monarchy come? After the elections you declared yourselves monarchists and us outlaws. Did you create the monarchy in the primaries? When the assembly convened, the monarchy

was proposed; there we have had great battles. Has the monarchy been established? The Conservatives, although they have not said so, have, I believe, agreed upon a candidate; the Radicals, more loquacious, have told us theirs; but have you, separated or united, produced a monarchy?

The Conservatives have a candidate who really represents the latest privilege granted the middle classes. Why is it that they do not bring him here? Because they know that this is a democratic monarchy, based, as it is supposably, on universal suffrage, and because the candidate has not, never had, and never will have, the votes, the indorsement, the backing of the people. And you? You want a monarchy to keep up appearances, a monarchy in order that Europe may say, "See how prudent, how God-fearing, how wise, how intelligent are the Spaniards; they have a disguised republic!" After a provisional government and a provisional regency you want a provisional monarchy also. You do not expect or want to be strong in the right, in liberty, in the will of the people, or in national sovereignty. All you want is a king who shall represent the predominance and the egotism of a party. You ought to know that, as the candidate of the Conservatives cannot come here without the consent of the people, your candidate cannot come without the consent of the Conservatives. Do you believe that your candidate will last if all the Conservative forces do not support him? Notwithstanding all that the Conservatives have declared to their representatives here, not one of them has said that he renounces his dynastic faith. Therefore, deputies, you cannot establish the monarchy.

On Saturday I pictured to you, in colors more or less vivid, the prestige which monarchical institutions have enjoyed in our country, and for this the minister of state upbraided me without understanding my arguments. I ask you to concentrate your attention for a moment upon the parallel which I am going to present, and which may be called a summary of this speech. I said the other afternoon that to establish monarchical institutions it was necessary to possess monarchical faith and sentiment. One must have the poetry and the traditions of monarchy. I said this because I know that, although the assembly and the

official authorities can make laws, they cannot decree ideas or sentiments, those real and solid foundations of institutions. Formerly, in other times, kings were representative of the national dignity, and now from those same benches we have heard that they sold their native soil to a foreigner, and even prostrated themselves at his feet, the people in the meantime answering the enemy with the second of May and the siege of Saragossa. Formerly poetry, addressing the throne, exclaimed:—

"Oh! what a profound abyss
Of iniquity and malice
The mighty of the world
Have made of your justice!"

Formerly art sketched the apotheosis of Charles V. with Titian's brush, or the ladies-in-waiting of Philip VI. with the brush of Velasquez; now it sketches the image of the communists, of the victims of Charles V., or the ship in which the Puritans took the republic to the bosom of virgin America. Formerly, the gala days of the people were the birthdays of kings and the anniversaries of the beginning of their reigns. Now, the great days of celebration are the tenth of August, the thirtieth of July, the twenty-fourth of February, and the twenty-ninth of September, days marking the expulsion of kings. Formerly, when a navigator landed in America, or an explorer went into the interior of a new country, the purest piece of gold, the largest pearl, the clearest diamond was reserved for the king. Now, your minister of the treasury claims from the king even the clasp which holds the royal mantle about his shoulders. I will not continue this parallel, as the chamber clearly sees the application.

What does this mean? What does it signify? If the throne has fallen, if the throne is broken, if the throne is dishonored, if the throne cannot be restored, conservatives, unionists, progressists, democrats, repeat with the poet:—

"Mankind, weep;
All of you laid your hands on him."

As there is no possibility of establishing the monarchy, as no candidate acceptable to all can be found, it is neces-

sary, it is indispensable to get rid of the suspense, and I say that we should establish a republic. Have you not said that the forms of government are accidental? Gentlemen, you know the republic I want. It is a federal republic. I shall always defend the federal republic. I am a federal, but, deputies, understand one thing, the republic is a form of government which admits many conditions, and which has many grades. From the republic of Venice to that of Switzerland there is an immense scale. Adjoining Mexico, where church and state are separated, there is Guatemala, where the clergy have great power. Close to the decentralized and federal Argentine Republic is the Chilian republic, another decentralized country enjoying great prosperity, its paper money being quoted in all the markets of Europe as high as that of England. Consequently, deputies, amid this great affliction and this great trouble and this unstable equilibrium which surrounds you, you can establish a form of government which is of the people and for the people, a form of government in harmony with the institutions you have proclaimed, and with the sentiment which all of you guard in the bottom of your hearts.

Have you not seen in history the inability of an assembly or any power to establish a form of government in conflict with great ideas? Remember the eighteenth century. Never had a monarchy attained more power, never was absolutism so strong, never was the destruction of obstacles in the way of kings more complete. Philosophy ascended the throne with them, ascended with Charles III. and Aranda and Tombal. It ascended with Joseph I., with Frederick the Great, with Leopold of Tuscany. All seemed to conspire to establish the same idea, the idea of a philosophy and a liberalism. And did they succeed? No, they were the Baptists of the Revolution. They repented late, and the philosophy they had thrown at the feet of the thrones came to naught. And what happened? Some were sentenced by the assembly. The crowns of divine right were melted into cannon balls by the soldiers of the Revolution. What does this signify? That great powers cannot place absolutism above philosophy any more than you can build monarchical institutions on individual rights. Therefore, I beseech you to establish the republic. You are assured

of our patriotism, our great interest in the country, our abnegation. Cato committed suicide because he found a Cæsar. Radicals of Spain, do not commit suicide because you cannot find a monarch. I have spoken.

THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY

IT was, gentlemen (if we may reckon by our republican calendar, which we also hold to be the proper calendar), it was the sixteenth day of Pluviose, in the second year of the French republic. The convention had assembled, that convention that had become the inspirer of the human conscience, and from which everything that sprang, both hatred and love, was of vast proportions, as in towering mountains altitudes are vast, and abysses are vast also. A man, a slave, had raised himself from the depth of his prison house to the height of the French Convention. He was a deputy, and turning to the assembly he said: "I belong to a race which is destitute of conscience, country, hearth, dignity, family, and I come to seek sanctuary—I come to draw this race within the protection of those rights which have been so admirably proclaimed by you. Your human rights, which have been appealed to for the advancement of individual rights, your human rights are a lie, your liberty is a lie, your equality is a lie, so long as you allow the enslavement of the negro."

Levasseur rose to support this petition of the slave. The assembly wavered, as waver all these great collective bodies when they are about to step over one of those mysterious lines which separate the hemispheres of time.

Lacroix said: "He is right. In proclaiming liberty of Frenchmen, we have forgotten the liberty of the negro, an omission which does not cease to be criminal because it has been unintentional. We can only redress this wrong by proclaiming, this very moment, the liberty of the negro." The assembly wavered still and then Lacroix cried out: "I beg of the convention not to disgrace itself by prolonging this incomprehensible debate." Then Danton rose, the child of the Encyclopedia, the most genuine personification

of his time, a very giant in his aims and in his actions, the moving spirit of the revolution, the life of a whole century concentrated in the conscience of an individual, the man who, like another Etna, bore upon his forehead the fire which leaped from the core of his heart, and the fire which, in that tempestuous epoch, struggled with the storms of heaven. Danton said: "Your liberty is the liberty of egotists, so long as you refuse to extend it to all mankind. Extend it to them, and then it will be human liberty. I demand, therefore, that we proclaim to the world the emancipation of every slave." The deputies, under the spell of these thoughts, rose like one man, and stretching their arms to heaven, as if they would take God to witness to these resolutions, unanimously abolished the slavery of negroes. A jubilant shout sounded through the tribunes. That shout spread to the surroundings of the assembly. It seemed as if human conscience drew a breath of relief in freeing itself from a mighty burden, a load of bitter remorse. The doors of the convention flew open as if some mysterious hand had moved them. The negroes who dwelt in Paris rushed into the place, and with tears embraced their liberators. Although the convention had committed very many crimes, the tears of the pariah redeemed, of the eternal Spartacus emancipated, of the slave restored to manhood, those generations, and the blessings of all the nations sacrificed on the degrading cross of slavery, those tears were sufficient to wash out forever all the stains of revolutionary bloodshed.

Slavery and liberty, slavery and morality, slavery and religion, slavery and the family, slavery and conscience, are terms incompatible:

Turn your glance toward rich and beautiful Cuba! Her climate is a perennial spring, her surface a boundless fruit garden, every plantation is crowned as with a garland, every thicket is like a bunch of flowers· the cane which distils honey, bourgeons again, for the eighth time, from its stock; her coffee groves and fields are numberless; side by side with the broad leaves of the plane tree the palm rears aloft its rustling diadem; the banana and the cocoa tree offer fruits which satisfy the hunger and slake the thirst by their refreshment; there is no venomous creature in that land,

and in the air a choir of singers raises a ceaseless strain to the heavens which are filled with the luster of tropical light. Liberty alone is absent. The fundamental rights of a people have no existence there. Some of the inhabitants seek for education in the republic of the United States, while others think of their country as still dominated by ancient Spanish absolutism. The creoles deny the Spaniards, who are their fathers, and the Spaniards curse the creoles, who are their sons. The negro is confined in the mill, or the prison, with chains round his neck or on his feet, with the lash held over his head—the image of God debased to the level of the beast. Asiatics, Chinese, in despair, reduced to servitude intolerable, hang themselves on the branches of trees, and bear on their faces, together with the expression of agony, the derisive sneer which emphasizes the horrible trick which they, by their suicide, have played upon their taskmasters. Upon these coasts a ceaseless war is waged between the slave-ship and the cruiser; war is everywhere, war incessant and infinite; for devastating violence unfolds itself in every direction, that spirit of destruction which belongs to the crime called slavery.

There is only one way of putting an end to these evils —the abolition of slavery. Can it be possible, can it be credible, that our nation is incapable of solving the great problem of abolition? What is now the nationality, or what soon will be the nationality, of all the peoples, excepting the people of the United States, which have founded republics in America? They are Spanish by race. And at what period did these people abolish slavery? It is very easy to enumerate this. Bolivia in 1826, Peru and Guatemala in 1827, Mexico in 1828, New Granada in 1849, Venezuela in 1853. In fact it is our race, our national spirit, our national conscience, that has abolished slavery.

And that reform has been wrought, among these sister nations, under none of the difficulties which confronted abolition in the United States. One after another, at different periods, these nations, in a day which was happy for themselves, laid the fetters of their slaves upon the altars of their country. And the slave owners, for their country's sake, refused all indemnification. And now that our race is the object of so much contumely, permit me here to offer

the consecrated tribute which is due to its generosity and to its self-abnegation. To have met and solved without difficulty so great a problem is a glory that can never die.

According to Aristotle, the children formed one, the parents another, and the slaves a third line in that triangle which is termed a family. Plato, more humane, or more keenly alive to the significance of general ideas, admitted, without hesitation, that certain classes were condemned to eternal servitude. In other places, especially Rome, slavery played a horrible part, and slaves consisted of those who were hunted in the forests, brought to Rome, sold at the gate of the temples, and fed, that they might be able to shed their life-blood in the arena of the circus. But the Roman slave was sculptor, painter, architect, musician, teacher; and in this manner held an influential position at Rome. In the time of Tacitus, it might be said that Rome was a city of slaves. And, let me ask you, what slave, from among those that belong to our fellow countrymen, bears the name of Terence; what slave, among those of our fellow countrymen, bears the name of Horace, the son of a freed slave; what slave, among those of our own fellow countrymen, bears the name of Epictetus, who educated the greatest and noblest mind of Cæsarean Rome, the mind of Marcus Aurelius? Your slaves are nothing but an opprobrium; they are wholly brutalized, they are millstones, mules, asses, instruments for the production of riches, and tools of the vilest toil. Oh, that the antique world might, in the sole person of Spartacus, place the servitude which it maintained face to face with that which we maintain! Numidian by race, Thracian by birthplace, Spartacus united in his veins the blood of the two peoples which Rome had especially tormented. Brought to the Eternal City, and fed up that he might have abundant blood to pour out in the circus, he conceived the idea of bringing liberty to his companions, to his brethren. He raised an army of thirty thousand men; twelve thousand of them perished in the struggle, and among them he himself fell, covered with wounds, the martyr of his faith, a greater hero than Jugurtha or Hannibal. The ancient world freed itself from the dangers of the servile war when Crassus, the punisher of Spartacus, returned through a row of ten thousand crosses, on which

were expiring ten thousand crucified slaves. Then, indeed, when the last hour of the ancient world was sounding, when the compatriots of Spartacus arrived at Rome with the armies of Alaric, in the last night of the ancient world, Rome, now vanquished, doomed to destruction, was forced to lift her eyes to heaven, and see the companions of Spartacus, like avenging angels, descending from their crosses, and scattering, to the four quarters of heaven, her blood-stained ashes. And do you doubt that such calamities will fall upon us, since we, by prolonging the reign of slavery, have committed crimes of equal atrocity?

I observe that there are in this chamber (and I mention it before I conclude) several priests. I believe, gentlemen, that these priests have come here for some other reason, for a very different object, than that of demanding the resurrection of the monarchy and the continuation of religious intolerance. I would not here enter into a discussion, nor would I desire to enter into it, nor is there place or occasion for it here—a discussion, I mean, as to whether slavery was or was not abolished by Christianity; I would merely say that here we have had nineteen centuries of Christianity —nineteen centuries during which liberty, equality, and evangelical fraternity have been preached, and all the while slavery has existed, and existed solely, gentlemen, among Catholic nations, for it has existed solely in Brazil and in Spain. And more than that, gentlemen, more than that! Scarcely has one century of revolution passed, and in all the revolutionary nations—in France, in England, in the United States—slavery has disappeared! Nineteen centuries of Christianity, and yet slavery among Catholic nations! One century of revolution, and slavery among the revolutionary nations disappears!

I leave this to your consideration. Nevertheless, Christianity is either the religion of the slave, or it is nothing. The hope of a Messiah was the hope of a people reared in bondage. Moses was born under the lash of the Pharaohs in Egypt; Christ was a subject of Rome, the son of a poor carpenter; He had no country, nowhere to lay His head; His first disciples were as He was; the first martyrs were slaves, and their teachings brought consolation to the souls of the oppressed, promising them, in exchange for the fet-

ters of earth, a starry crown in heaven. The cross, the ensign and inspiration of modern society, was the most degraded of emblems in ancient society—it was the gibbet of the slave. But, gentlemen, I am a freethinker. I am no partizan; I cannot be one. Conscience imposes ideas upon us, and we cannot evade their consequences. I cannot champion the whole faith, the whole beliefs, the whole ideas which the priests of this chamber maintain. Nevertheless, if I were a priest, if I had received the high honor of admittance into this lofty class, if, while occupied in the most sublime mysteries of religion, I were to share all your faith, I would say: The Creator humbled Himself to us; those hands which fashioned the world were pierced by the vile nail of servile torture; those lips which breathed the breath of life uttered the sigh of death; He who gathered together the waters was athirst; He who created the light, felt darkness closing over His eyes; the redemption which He wrought was for this worm, this wretched worm of the earth, whose name is man; and yet the blood of His wounds has been shed in vain, for everywhere upon this earth, from which I am elevating the host, there are men without family, without dignity, without conscience, machines rather than responsible beings, things rather than persons. Now rise up, ye slaves! for ye have a country; ye have received your redemption, for God is there. And you, ye slave-traders, flee, flee from the wrath of heaven; for you, in reducing man to slavery, have done violence to liberty, have done violence to equality, have done violence to fraternity, and canceled the evangelic promises which were sealed with the divine blood of Calvary. [Applause.]

Señor Plaza said to us the other evening: "It is very evident that the gentlemen on the front bench are not slave owners." No, we are not slave owners; we have been slaves ourselves, and for that very reason do we claim freedom for our brethren. We belong to the servile class, to the class which has become emancipated and now is eager to emancipate their fellow men. Yes, we plebeians have been pariahs in India; we have been dragged along at the tail of the Persian horse; we have been offered in sacrifice to implacable gods; we have poured out our blood in the circus; we have been scourged to death; a part of our soul

wanders in the new world, with the negroes, mourning over their sorrows, which are ours also, and we are seeking redemption for ourselves, we who have been redeemed by the revolution.

Sons of this century, which ye proclaim to be greater than that fifteenth century which was from its discoveries the first of modern history, and greater than that eighteenth century, which from its revolutions was the last of modern history, arise! Legislators of Spain, arise and make of this nineteenth century, you who can give to it its impetus and inspiration, the century of redemption, definite and complete, for every slave!

COUNT CAMILLO BENSO DI CAVOUR

ROME AND ITALY

[Count Camillo Benso di Cavour, an Italian statesman, styled "the regenerator of Italy," was born at Turin in 1810, of an ancient and noble family. He received a military education, but resigned from the army shortly after receiving a commission, and devoted himself to the advancement of those ideas of a unified Italy which he was destined to realize so brilliantly. Becoming the recognized exponent of Sardinian policy, he held in turn the portfolios of agriculture and commerce, of finance, and of the navy, and for nine years he was premier. He settled the Roman clerical question by pronouncing in favor of complete separation of church and state, and he paved the way for the meeting, at Turin, of the first Italian parliament. Having thus completed his life work by the establishment of a practically united country—for Rome and Venice were secured to the new kingdom in a very short time—Cavour was preparing a general Italian policy when death cut short his career in 1861. The speech given here is one of his most eloquent appeals to the people in favor of a unified Italy, and was made in 1861, shortly before his death.]

ROME should be the capital of Italy. There can be no solution of the Roman question without the acceptance of this premise by Italy and by all Europe. If any one could conceive of a united Italy with any degree of stability, and without Rome for its capital, I would declare the Roman question difficult, if not impossible, of solution. And why have we the right, the duty, of insisting that Rome shall be united to Italy? Because without Rome as the capital of Italy, Italy cannot exist.

This truth, being felt instinctively by all Italians, being asserted abroad by all who judge Italian affairs impartially, needs no demonstration, but is upheld by the judgment of the nation.

And yet, gentlemen, this truth is susceptible of a very simple proof. Italy has still much to do before it will rest upon a stable basis; much to do in solving the grave problems raised by her unification; much to do in overcoming all the obstacles which time-honored traditions oppose to this great undertaking. And if this end must be compassed, it is essential that there be no cause of dissidence, of failure. Until the question of the capital of Italy is determined, there will be endless discords among the different provinces.

It is easy to understand how persons of good faith, cultured and talented, are now suggesting, some on historical, some on artistic grounds, and also for many other reasons, the advisability of establishing the capital in some other city of Italy. Such a discussion is quite comprehensible now, but if Italy already had her capital in Rome, do you think this question would be even possible? Assuredly not. Even those who are now opposed to transferring the capital to Rome, if it were once established there, would not dream of removing it. Therefore, it is only by proclaiming Rome the capital of Italy that we can put an end to these dissensions among ourselves.

I am grieved that men of eminence, men of genius, men who have rendered glorious service to the cause of Italian unity, should drag this question into the field of debate, and there discuss it with (dare I say it?) puerile arguments. The question of the capital, gentlemen, is not determined by climate, by topography, nor even by strategical considerations. If these things affected the selection, I think I may safely say that London would not be the capital of England, nor, perhaps, Paris of France. The selection of the capital is determined by great moral reasons. It is the will of the people that decides this question touching them so closely.

In Rome, gentlemen, are united all the circumstances, whether historic, intellectual, or moral, that should determine the site of the capital of a great state. Rome is the only city with traditions not purely local. The entire history of Rome, from the time of Cæsar to the present day, is the history of a city whose importance reaches far beyond her confines; of a city destined to be one of the capitals of the world. Convinced, profoundly convinced, of this truth,

I feel constrained to declare it solemnly to you and to the nation, and I feel bound to appeal in this matter to the patriotism of every citizen of Italy, and to the representatives of her most eminent cities, that discussions may cease, and that he who represents the nation before other powers may be able to proclaim that the necessity of having Rome as the capital is recognized by all the nation. I think I am justified in making this appeal even to those who, for reasons which I respect, differ with me on this point. Yet more: I can assume no Spartan indifference in the matter. I say frankly that it will be a deep grief to me to tell my native city that she must renounce resolutely and definitively all hope of being the seat of government.

Yes, gentlemen, as far as I am personally concerned, it is no pleasure to go to Rome. Having little artistic taste, I feel sure that in the midst of the splendid monuments of ancient and modern Rome I will lament the plain and unpoetic streets of my native town. But one thing I can say with confidence: Knowing the character of my fellow citizens, knowing from actual facts how ready they have always been to make the greatest sacrifices for the sacred cause of Italy, knowing their willingness to make sacrifices when their city was invaded by the enemy, and their promptness and energy in its defense—knowing all this, I have no fear that they will not uphold me when, in their name and as their deputy, I say that Turin is ready to make this great sacrifice in the interests of united Italy.

I am comforted by the hope—I may even say the certainty—that when Italy shall have established the seat of government in the Eternal City, she will not be ungrateful to this land which was the cradle of liberty; to this land in which was sown that germ of independence which, maturing rapidly and branching out, has now reached forth its tendrils from Sicily to the Alps.

I have said and I repeat: Rome, and Rome only, should be the capital of Italy.

But here begin the difficulties of the problem. We must go to Rome, but there are two conditions: We must go there in concert with France, otherwise the union of Rome with the rest of Italy will be interpreted by the great mass of Catholics, within Italy and without, as the signal

of the slavery of the church. We must go, therefore, to Rome in such a way that the true independence of the pontiff will not be diminished. We must go to Rome, but the civil power must not extend to spiritual things. These are the two conditions that must be fulfilled if this united Italy is to exist.

As to the first, it would be folly, in the present condition of affairs in Europe, to think of going to Rome in the face of the opposition of France. Yet more: even if, through events which I believe improbable and impossible, France were reduced to a condition which forbade material interference with our actions, we should none the less avoid uniting Rome to the rest of Italy, if, by so doing, we caused loss to our allies.

We have contracted a great debt toward France. I do not claim that the narrow moral code which affects individual actions should be applied *ad literam* to international relations. Still there are certain moral principles which even nations may not violate with impunity.

I know that many diplomats profess contrary views. I remember hearing a famous Austrian statesman applauded a few years ago when he laughingly declared that in a short time Austria would astound Europe by her ingratitude to Russia. As a matter of fact, Austria kept her word; you already know, and if you do not I can testify to the fact, that at the Congress of Paris no power showed more hostility to Russia or tried harder to aggravate the conditions of peace than Austria, whose sword had done nothing toward imposing peace upon her old ally. But, gentlemen, the violation of that great moral principle did not go unpunished. After a few years Russia had her revenge; and we should be glad of it, for I do not hesitate to attribute to the unforgotten ingratitude of Austria the facility with which friendly relations were established between Russia and ourselves, relations now unfortunately interrupted, but, I hope, without changing the feelings of Russia for Italy, and without any alteration of the sympathy for us which has always dwelt in the bosom of the Czar.

Gentlemen, we have an even graver motive for cooperating with France. When, in 1859, we invoked French aid, when the emperor consented to descend into Italy at

the head of his legions, he made no secret of his pledges to the court of Rome. We accepted his aid without protest against those pledges. Now, after reaping such advantages from that alliance, we can protest against the pledges only to a certain point. But then, you will object, the solution of the Roman question is impossible!

I answer: If the second of our conditions is fulfilled, the first will offer few obstacles. That is, if we can so act that the reunion of Rome to Italy does not cause alarm to Catholic society. By Catholic society I mean the great mass of people who profess religious belief from conviction and not for political ends, and who are free from vulgar prejudices. If, I say, we can persuade the great mass of Catholics that the uniting of Rome to Italy can be accomplished without sacrificing the liberty of the church, the problem will, I think, be solved.

We must not deceive ourselves; there are many who, while not prejudiced against Italy nor against liberal ideas, yet fear that, if Rome were united to Italy, the seat of Italian government established there and the king seated in the Quirinal, the pontiff would lose both dignity and independence; they fear that the pope, instead of being the head of Catholicism, would be reduced to the rank of grand almoner or head chaplain.

If these fears were well founded, if the fall of the temporal power would really have this consequence, I would not hesitate to say that the union of Rome to the Italian state would be fatal not only to Catholicism, but to the existence of Italy itself. Yet further, I can imagine no greater misfortune for a cultured people than to see in the hands of its rulers not only the civil, but also the religious power.

The history of centuries proves to us that wherever this union was consummated civilization immediately ceased to advance and, therefore, necessarily began to retrograde; the most detestable of despotisms followed, and this whether a caste of priests usurped the temporal power, or a caliph or sultan seized control of things spiritual. Every where this fatal union has produced the same result; God forbid that it should ever be so here! . . .

When these doctrines have received the solemn sanction

of the national parliament, when it will be no longer lawful to doubt the feelings of Italians, when it is clear to the world that they are not hostile to the religion of their fathers, but wish to preserve this religion in their country, when it is no longer necessary to show them how to prosper and to develop their resources by combating a power which was an obstacle, not only to the reorganization of Italy but also to the spread of Catholicity, I believe that the greater part of Catholic society will absolve the Italians, and will place where it belongs the responsibility of the fatal struggle which the pope insists upon waging against the country in whose midst he lives.

But God avert this fatal chance! At the risk of being considered utopian, I believe that when the proclamation of the principles which I have just declared, and when the indorsement of them that you will give, are known and considered at Rome and in the Vatican, I believe, I say, that those Italian fibers which the reactionary party has, as yet, been unable to remove from the heart of Pius IX. will again vibrate, and there will be accomplished the greatest act that any people have yet performed. And so it will be given to the same generation to have restored a nation, and to have done what is yet greater, yet more sublime, an act of which the influence is incalculable, that is, to have reconciled the papacy with the civil power, to have made peace between church and state, between the spirit of religion and the great principles of liberty. Yes, I hope that it will be given us to compass these two great acts, which will most assuredly carry to the most distant posterity the worthiness of the present generation of Italians.

JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN

THE TRUE CONCEPTION OF EMPIRE

[Joseph Chamberlain, a leading English statesman, was born in London in 1836. He was educated in University College School and entered business life in Birmingham, where his father had large manufacturing interests. Upon his father's death he gave up mercantile pursuits in order to devote himself to municipal affairs. He had already made himself noted by his radical views and by his ready oratory. He was elected member of the Birmingham local council, and became mayor of the city for three successive terms. In 1876 he entered Parliament, and became leader of the radicals in the House of Commons for many years. He held office as president of the Board of Trade under Gladstone, but when the Home Rule Bill was laid before the House of Commons in 1886 he renounced his political allegiance and declared himself a Unionist. In 1895, however, he accepted the post of secretary of state for the colonies under the Salisbury administration. His imperialist policy led to much criticism during the Boer war that ended in 1902, but the issue of the conflict was looked upon by many as the result of his far-seeing statesmanship. The first of the following speeches was made in London in 1897; the second, "Splendid Isolation," was also delivered in London, in 1896.]

I HAVE now the honor to propose to you the toast of "Prosperity to the Royal Colonial Institute." The institute was founded in 1868, almost exactly a generation ago, and I confess that I admire the faith of its promoters, who, in a time not altogether favorable to their opinions, sowed the seeds of imperial patriotism, although they must have known that few of them could live to gather the fruit and to reap the harvest. But their faith has been justified by the result of their labors, and their foresight must be recognized in the light of our present experience.

It seems to me that there are three distinct stages in our imperial history. We began to be, and we ultimately became, a great imperial power in the eighteenth century;

but, during the greater part of that time, the colonies were regarded, not only by us but by every European power that possessed them, as possessions valuable in proportion to the pecuniary advantage which they brought to the mother country, which, under that order of ideas, was not truly a mother at all, but appeared rather in the light of a grasping and absentee landlord, desiring to take from his tenants the utmost rents he could exact. The colonies were valued and maintained because it was thought that they would be a source of profit—of direct profit—to the mother country.

That was the first stage, and when we were rudely awakened by the War of Independence in America from this dream that the colonies could be held for our profit alone, the second chapter was entered upon, and public opinion seems then to have drifted to the opposite extreme; and, because the colonies were no longer a source of revenue, it seems to have been believed and argued by many people that their separation from us was only a matter of time, and that that separation should be desired and encouraged, lest, haply, they might prove an encumbrance and a source of weakness.

It was while those views were still entertained, while the Little Englanders were in their full career, that this institute was founded to protest against doctrines so injurious to our interests and so derogatory to our honor; and I rejoice that what was then, as it were, "a voice crying in the wilderness," is now the expressed and determined will of the overwhelming majority of the British people. Partly by the efforts of this institute and similar organizations, partly by the writings of such men as Froude and Seeley, but mainly by the instinctive good sense and patriotism of the people at large, we have now reached the third stage in our history, and the true conception of our empire. What is that conception? As regards the self-governing colonies, we no longer talk of them as dependencies. The sense of possession has given place to the sentiment of kinship.

We think and speak of them as part of ourselves, as part of the British empire, united to us, although they may be dispersed throughout the world, by ties of kindred, of

religion, of history, and of language, and joined to us by the seas that formerly seemed to divide us.

But the British empire is not confined to the self-governing colonies and the United Kingdom. It includes a much greater area, a much more numerous population, in tropical climes, where no considerable European settlement is possible, and where the native population must always vastly outnumber the white inhabitants; and in these cases also the same change has come over the imperial idea. Here also the sense of possession has given place to a different sentiment—the sense of obligation. We feel now that our rule over these territories can only be justified if we can show that it adds to the happiness and prosperity of the people, and I maintain that our rule does, and has, brought security and peace and comparative prosperity to countries that never knew these blessings before.

In carrying out this work of civilization we are fulfilling what I believe to be our national mission, and we are finding scope for the exercise of those faculties and qualities which have made of us a great governing race. I do not say that our success has been perfect in every case, I do not say that all our methods have been beyond reproach; but I do say that in almost every instance in which the rule of the queen has been established and the great *pax Britannica* has been enforced, there has come with it greater security to life and property, and a material improvement in the condition of the bulk of the population. No doubt, in the first instance, when these conquests have been made, there has been bloodshed, there has been loss of life among the native populations, loss of still more precious lives among those who have been sent out to bring these countries into some kind of disciplined order, but it must be remembered that that is the condition of the mission we have to fulfil. There are, of course, among us—there always are among us, I think—a very small minority of men who are ready to be the advocates of the most detestable tyrants, provided their skin is black—men who sympathize with the sorrows of Prempeh and Lobengula, and who denounce as murderers those of their countrymen who have gone forth at the command of the queen, and who have redeemed districts as large as Europe from the barbarism and the super-

stition in which they have been steeped for centuries. I remember a picture by Mr. Selous of a philanthropist—an imaginary philanthropist, I will hope—sitting cosily by his fireside and denouncing the methods by which British civilization was promoted. This philanthropist complained of the use of Maxim guns and other instruments of warfare, and asked why we could not proceed by more conciliatory methods, and why the impis of Lobengula could not be brought before a magistrate, fined five shillings, and bound over to keep the peace.

No doubt there is humorous exaggeration in this picture, but there is gross exaggeration in the frame of mind against which it was directed. You cannot have omelets without breaking eggs; you cannot destroy the practises of barbarism, of slavery, of superstition, which for centuries have desolated the interior of Africa, without the use of force; but if you will fairly contrast the gain to humanity with the price which we are bound to pay for it, I think you may well rejoice in the result of such expeditions as those which have recently been conducted with such signal success in Nyassaland, Ashanti, Benin, and Nupé—expeditions which may have, and indeed have, cost valuable lives, but as to which we may rest assured that for one life lost a hundred will be gained, and the cause of civilization and the prosperity of the people will, in the long run, be eminently advanced. But no doubt such a state of things, such a mission as I have described, involve heavy responsibility. In the wide dominions of the queen the doors of the temple of Janus are never closed, and it is a gigantic task that we have undertaken when we have determined to wield the scepter of empire. Great is the task, great is the responsibility, but great is the honor; and I am convinced that the conscience and the spirit of the country will rise to the height of its obligations, and that we shall have the strength to fulfil the mission which our history and our national character have imposed upon us.

In regard to the self-governing colonies our task is much lighter. We have undertaken, it is true, to protect them with all the strength at our command against foreign aggression, although I hope that the need for our intervention may never arise. But there remains what then will be our

chief duty—that is, to give effect to that sentiment of kinship to which I have referred, and which I believe is deep in the heart of every Briton. We want to promote a closer and a firmer union between all members of the great British race, and in this respect we have in recent years made great progress—so great that I think sometimes some of our friends are apt to be a little hasty, and to expect even a miracle to be accomplished. I would like to ask them to remember that time and patience are essential elements in the development of all great ideas. Let us, gentlemen, keep our ideal always before us. For my own part, I believe in the practical possibility of a federation of the British race; but I know that it will come, if it does come, not by pressure, not by anything in the nature of dictation from this country, but it will come as the realization of a universal desire, as the expression of the dearest wish of our colonial fellow subjects themselves.

That such a result would be desirable, would be in the interest of all of our colonies as well as of ourselves, I do not believe any sensible man will doubt. It seems to me that the tendency of the time is to throw all power into the hands of the greater empires, and the minor kingdoms—those which are non-progressive—seem to be destined to fall into a secondary and subordinate place. But if Greater Britain remains united, no empire in the world can ever surpass it in area, in population, in wealth, or in the diversity of its resources.

Let us, then, have confidence in the future. I do not ask you to anticipate with Lord Macaulay the time when the New Zealander will come here to gaze upon the ruins of a great dead city. There are in our present condition no visible signs of decrepitude and decay. The mother country is still vigorous and fruitful, is still able to send forth troops of stalwart sons to people and to occupy the waste spaces of the earth; but yet it may well be that some of these sister nations whose love and affection we eagerly desire may in the future equal and even surpass our greatness. A trans-oceanic capital may arise, across the seas, which will throw into shade the glories of London itself; but in the years that must intervene let it be our endeavor, let it be our task, to keep alight the torch of imperial patri-

otism, to hold fast the affection and the confidence of our kinsmen across the seas, that so in every vicissitude of fortune the British empire may present an unbroken front to all her foes, and may carry on even to distant ages the glorious traditions of the British flag. It is because I believe that the Royal Colonial Institute is contributing to this result that with all sincerity I propose the toast of the evening.

SPLENDID ISOLATION

I THINK that I see before me a representative gathering of British subjects, whose principal interests lie in that great group of Australian colonies whose present greatness and importance give us but a faint indication of the splendid future which awaits them. For of one thing I am certain, whatever may be the fate of the old country—and even as to that I have sufficient confidence—no man can doubt that our vigorous offspring in the southern seas are bound, at no distant time, to rival the older civilization of the continent of Europe in wealth, in population, and in all the attributes of a great nation. But although, as I have said, your interests lie in this direction, I have an instinctive feeling that to-night you are thinking not so much of Australian politics and of Australian progress as you are of events that have recently occurred in another quarter of the globe, and of their connection with imperial interests. If that be so, I hail the fact as another proof of the solidarity of imperial sentiment in making it impossible that a blow can be struck or a chord sounded in even the most distant portion of the queen's dominions, without an echo coming back from every other part of the British empire.

It would be inopportune in me, it would be improper, if I were to dwell on the incidents which have diverted attention to South Africa. Those incidents will be the subject of judicial inquiry in this country and in Africa, and I assume that, with the fair-mindedness which distinguishes them, my countrymen will wait to hear both the indictment and the defense before they pronounce a judg-

ment. But, in the meantime, I will venture to say that I think there is a tendency to attach too much importance to sensational occurrences which pass away and leave no trace behind, and not enough to the general course of British policy and the general current of colonial progress. I have heard it said that we never have had a colonial policy, that we have simply blundered into all the best places in the earth. I admit that we have made mistakes. I have no doubt that we are answerable for sins of commission as well as for sins of omission; but, after all is said, this remains: that we alone among the nations of the earth have been able to establish and to maintain colonies under different conditions in all parts of the world, that we have maintained them to their own advantage and to ours, and that we have secured not only the loyal attachment of all British subjects, but the general good will of the races, whether they be native or whether they be European, that have thus come under the British flag. This may be a comforting assurance when we think of occasional mistakes, and when we are rebuked even for our misfortunes we may find some consolation in our success.

There is, gentlemen, another consideration which I think is not inappropriate to such a gathering as this. A few weeks ago England appeared to stand alone in the world, surrounded by jealous competitors and by altogether unexpected hostility. Differences between ourselves and other nations which were of long standing appeared suddenly to come to a head and to assume threatening proportions; and from quarters to which we might have looked for friendship and consideration—having regard to our traditions and to a certain community of interest—we were confronted with suspicion, and even with hate. We had to recognize that our success itself, however legitimate, was imputed to us as a crime; that our love of peace was taken as a sign of weakness; and that our indifference to foreign criticism was construed into an invitation to insult us. The prospect of our discomfiture was regarded with hardly disguised satisfaction by our competitors, who, at the same time, must have been forced to own that we alone held our possessions throughout the world in trust for all, and that we admit them to our markets as freely as we do our own subjects. I regret

that such a feeling should exist, and that we should be forced to acknowledge its existence; but, as it does exist, I rejoice that it found expression. No better service was ever done to this nation, for it has enabled us to show, in face of all, that while we are resolute to fulfil our obligations we are equally determined to maintain our rights.

Three weeks ago, in the words of Mr. Foster, the leader of the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, "the great mother empire stood splendidly isolated." And how does she stand to-day? She stands secure in the strength of her own resources, in the firm resolution of her people without respect to party, and in the abundant loyalty of her children from one end of the empire to another.

The resolution which was conveyed to the prime minister on behalf of the Australian colonies, and the display of patriotic enthusiasm on the part of the Dominion of Canada, came to us as a natural response to the outburst of national spirit in the United Kingdom, and as a proof that British hearts beat in unison throughout the world, whatever may be the distances that separate us.

Then let us cultivate those sentiments. Let us do all in our power, by improving our communications, by developing our commercial relations, by cooperating in mutual defense, and none of us then will ever feel isolated; no part of the empire will stand alone, so long as it can count upon the common interest of all in its welfare and in its security. That is the moral I have derived from recent events. That is the lesson I desire to impress on my countrymen. In the words of Tennyson, let

> Britain's myriad voices call,
> "Sons, be welded, each and all,
> Into one imperial whole,
> One with Britain, heart and soul!
> One life, one flag, one fleet, one Throne!"

And in the time to come, the time that must come, when these colonies of ours have grown in stature, in population, and in strength, this league of kindred nations, this federation of Great Britain, will not only provide for its own security, but will be a potent factor in maintaining the peace of the world.

Our guest to-night goes out to take his part in this work of drawing tighter the bonds which unite us to our children in the Antipodes. He goes to an infant colony, an infant which is destined to become a giant, and the future possibilities of which no man can measure. Queensland has an area which—shall I say?—is three times greater than the German empire. [Laughter and cheers.] It has a soil which can produce anything. It has vast mineral resources. In a generation its population has increased fifteen-fold. It has already a revenue of three or four millions sterling. It has completed 2,500 miles of railway. It has exports valued at ten millions sterling, all of them, except a small fraction, coming to the United Kingdom or to some of the British possessions. Yet this colony of Queensland, great as it is, is only one of seven, all equally important, equally energetic, equally prosperous, equally loyal. I say that the relations between these colonies and ourselves are questions of momentous import to us both, and I hope that our rulers and our people will leave no stone unturned to show the store that we all set on the continued amity, the continued affection, of our kindred beyond the sea. That is the message we ask Lord Lamington to take with him, and we wish him health and prosperity in the colony over which he is about to preside.

[In responding to the toast of "The Chairman," which was proposed by Sir James Garrick, Mr. Chamberlain said]:—

Nothing could be more gratifying to me than that this toast should have been proposed by the eloquent representative of the colony which we have met to honor as well as its future governor, and nothing could be more agreeable than the kindly response which you have given to the toast. It almost emboldens me to think that there may yet be occasions upon which I shall venture to address my fellow countrymen—a point on which, I admit, I have had grave doubts since I have become acquainted with certain criticisms of my recent performances. When I became secretary of state for the colonies I accepted with that office certain duties, not the least pleasant being that of presiding over gatherings similar to this. I attended a meeting of the friends of South Africa on an occasion interesting especially to our colony of Natal, and I made a speech upon

that occasion in which, in my simple and ingenuous way, I ventured to point out that this was, on the whole, a considerable empire, and that any true view of its perspective would take into account the greatness of the colonies and the magnitude of their resources, as well as the past history of the mother country. And thereupon I was surprised to read, in the report of a speech of a minor luminary of the late government on the occasion of the recent raid into the Transvaal, that that unfortunate occurrence was entirely due to the "spread-eagle speech" which I had made. It is extraordinary what great events spring from trifling causes. I had no conception that my words would travel so far or have so great an influence. To the best of my knowledge and belief, I have never made a "spread-eagle" speech in my life. I think I have been able to distinguish between patriotism and jingoism. But in order that there may be no mistake, I desire to say now, in the most formal way, that the few remarks which I have addressed to you to-night are not to be taken as an intimation to any individual to carry on war on his own account, or to make an invasion upon a friendly nation with which we are at present at peace. But this is not all, because this afternoon I read in an evening newspaper that this same speech, which I thought so natural and so innocent, was really the dictating cause of our difficulties in British Guiana, and of the complications with our cousins across the Atlantic. It appears that in speaking of imperial unity, in endeavoring to popularize that idea among my countrymen, I am giving offense to other nations.

Gentlemen, I cannot help thinking that Lord Rosebery was mistaken when, a short time ago, he said that the "Little Englanders" no longer existed among us. A pretty pass we must have come to if the minister who is responsible for the British colonies is forbidden to speak of their future, of their greatness, of the importance of maintaining friendly relations with them, of the necessity of promoting the unity of the British race, for fear of giving offense. I remember a story of a certain burgomaster in a continental town to whom complaints were made that naughty boys were accustomed to throw mud upon the passers-by. He was asked to intervene, and he issued a proclamation which

was to the effect that all respectable inhabitants were requested to wear their second-hand clothes in order not to give offense. I do not so understand the position which I hold. I decline to speak with bated breath of our colonies for fear of giving offense to foreign nations. We mean them no harm; we hope they mean us none. But not for any such consideration will we be withheld from speaking of points which have for us the greatest interest and upon which the future of our empire depends. Sir James Garrick has kindly attributed to me very creditable motives in seeking the office which has been conferred upon me. He is, perhaps, not far wrong in thinking that I have long believed that the future of the colonies and the future of this country were interdependent, and that this was a creative time; that this was the opportunity which, once let slip, might never recur, for bringing together all the people who are under the British flag, and for consolidating them into a great self-sustaining and self-protecting empire, whose future will be worthy of the traditions of the race.

SALMON PORTLAND CHASE

THE KANSAS-NEBRASKA BILL

[Salmon Portland Chase, an American statesman and jurist, and a speaker of ability, was born in New Hampshire in 1808. He was graduated at Dartmouth College and settled in Ohio, practicing law there with success. The slavery question drew him into public life, and he became United States senator from Ohio, governor of Ohio, secretary of the treasury under Lincoln, and finally chief justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. While holding this last office he was called upon to preside at the impeachment of President Johnson. His name was more than once prominently mentioned in connection with the Republican nomination for the presidency. He died in 1873. The speech on the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which was one of the burning questions of that day, was made in the United States Senate in 1854.]

MR. PRESIDENT: I had occasion a few days ago to expose the utter groundlessness of the personal charges made by the senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] against myself and the other signers of the Independent Democratic appeal. I now move to strike from this bill a statement which I will to-day demonstrate to be without any foundation in fact or history. I intend afterward to move to strike out the whole clause annulling the Missouri prohibition.

I enter into this debate, Mr. President, in no spirit of personal unkindness. The issue is too grave and too momentous for the indulgence of such feelings. I see the great question before me, and that question only.

Sir, these crowded galleries, these thronged lobbies, this full attendance of the Senate, prove the deep, transcendent interest of the theme.

A few days only have elapsed since the Congress of the United States assembled in this capitol. Then no agitation seemed to disturb the political elements. Two of the

great political parties of the country in their national conventions had announced that slavery agitation was at an end, and that henceforth that subject was not to be discussed in Congress or out of Congress. The President in his annual message had referred to this state of opinion, and had declared his fixed purpose to maintain, as far as any responsibility attached to him, the quiet of the country. Let me read a brief extract from that message:—

"It is no part of my purpose to give prominence to any subject which may properly be regarded as set at rest by the deliberate judgment of the people. But while the present is bright with promise, and the future full of demand and inducement for the exercise of active intelligence, the past can never be without useful lessons of admonition and instruction. If its dangers serve not as beacons, they will evidently fail to fulfil the object of a wise design.

"When the grave shall have closed over all those who are now endeavoring to meet the obligations of duty, the year 1850 will be recurred to as a period filled with anxious apprehension. A successful war had just terminated. Peace brought with it a vast augmentation of territory. Disturbing questions arose bearing upon the domestic institutions of one portion of the confederacy, and involving the constitutional rights of the states. But notwithstanding differences of opinion and sentiment which then existed in relation to details and specific provisions, the acquiescence of distinguished citizens, whose devotion to the Union can never be doubted, had given renewed vigor to our institutions, and restored a sense of repose and security to the public mind throughout the confederacy. That this repose is to suffer no shock during my official term, if I have power to avert it, those who placed me here may be assured."

The agreement of the two old political parties thus referred to by the chief magistrate of the country was complete, and a large majority of the American people seemed to acquiesce in the legislation of which he spoke.

A few of us, indeed, doubted the accuracy of these statements and the permanency of this repose. We never believed that the acts of 1850 would prove to be a permanent adjustment of the slavery question. We believed no permanent adjustment of that question possible except by a return to that original policy of the fathers of the republic, by which slavery was restricted within state limits, and freedom without exception or limitation was

intended to be secured to every person outside of state limits and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the general government.

But, sir, we only represented a small though vigorous and growing party in the country. Our number was small in Congress. By some we were regarded as visionaries—by some as factionists; while almost all agreed in pronouncing us mistaken.

And so, sir, the country was at peace. As the eye swept the entire circumference of the horizon and upward to mid-heaven, not a cloud appeared; to common observation there was no mist or stain upon the clearness of the sky.

But suddenly all is changed. Rattling thunder breaks from the cloudless firmament. The storm bursts forth in fury. Warring winds rush into conflict:—

"Eurus, Notusque ruunt, creberque procellis Africus."

Yes, sir, *creber procellis Africus*—the south wind thick with storm. And now we find ourselves in the midst of an agitation the end and issue of which no man can foresee.

Now, sir, who is responsible for this renewal of strife and controversy? Not we, for we have introduced no question of territorial slavery into Congress—not we who are denounced as agitators and factionists. No, sir; the quietists and the finalists have become agitators—they who told us that all agitation was quieted, and that the resolutions of the political conventions put a final period to the discussion of slavery.

This will not escape the observation of the country. It is slavery that renews the strife. It is slavery that again wants room. It is slavery, with its insatiate demands for more slave territory and more slave states.

And what does slavery ask for now? Why, sir, it demands that a time-honored and sacred compact shall be rescinded—a compact which has endured through a whole generation—a compact which has been universally regarded as inviolable, North and South—a compact the constitutionality of which few have doubted and by which all have consented to abide.

It will not answer to violate such a compact without

a pretext. Some plausible ground must be discovered or invented for such an act; and such a ground is supposed to be found in the doctrine which was advanced the other day by the senator from Illinois, that the compromise acts of 1850 "superseded" the prohibition of slavery north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, in the act preparatory for the admission of Missouri. Aye, sir, "superseded" is the phrase—"superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the compromise measures."

It is against this statement, untrue in fact and without foundation in history, that the amendment which I have proposed is directed.

Sir, this is a novel idea. At the time when these measures were before Congress in 1850, when the questions involved in them were discussed from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month, in this Senate chamber, who ever heard that the Missouri prohibition was to be superseded? What man, at what time, in what speech, ever suggested the idea that the acts of that year were to affect the Missouri compromise?

The senator from Illinois the other day invoked the authority of Henry Clay—that departed statesman in respect to whom whatever may be the differences of political opinion, none question that among the great men of this country he stood proudly eminent. Did he in the report made by him as the chairman of the committee of thirteen, or in any speech in support of the compromise acts, or in any conversation in the committee or out of the committee, ever even hint at this doctrine of supersedure? Did any supporter or any opponent of the compromise acts ever vindicate or condemn them on the ground that the Missouri prohibition would be affected by them? Well, sir, the compromise acts were passed. They were denounced North, and they were denounced South. Did any defender of them at the South ever justify his support of them upon the ground that the South had obtained through them the repeal of the Missouri prohibition? Did any objector to them at the North ever even suggest as a ground of condemnation that that prohibition was swept away by them? No, sir! No man, North or South, during the whole of the discussion of those acts here, or in that other discussion

which followed their enactment throughout the country, ever intimated any such opinion.

Now, sir, let us come to the last session of Congress. A Nebraska bill passed the House and came to the Senate, and was reported from the committee on territories by the senator from Illinois as its chairman. Was there any provision in it which even squinted toward this notion of repeal by supersedure? Why, sir, Southern gentlemen opposed it on the very ground that it left the territory under the operation of the Missouri prohibition. The senator from Illinois made a speech in defense of it. Did he invoke Southern support upon the ground that it superseded the Missouri prohibition? Not at all. Was it opposed or vindicated by anybody on any such ground? Every senator knows the contrary. The senator from Missouri [Mr. Atchison], now the president of this body, made a speech upon the bill in which he distinctly declared that the Missouri prohibition was not repealed and could not be repealed.

I will send this speech to the secretary and ask him to read the paragraphs marked. [The secretary read as follows]:—

"I will now state to the Senate the views which induced me to oppose this proposition in the early part of this session.

"I had two objections to it. One was that the Indian title in that territory had not been extinguished, or at least a very small portion of it had been. Another was the Missouri compromise, or, as it is commonly called, the slavery restriction. It was my opinion at that time—and I am not now very clear on that subject—that the law of Congress, when the state of Missouri was admitted into the Union, excluding slavery from the territory of Louisiana north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, would be enforced in that territory unless it was specially rescinded, and whether that law was in accordance with the Constitution of the United States or not, it would do its work, and that work would be to preclude slaveholders from going into that territory. But when I came to look into that question I found that there was no prospect, no hope, of a repeal of the Missouri compromise excluding slavery from that territory.

"Now, sir, I am free to admit that at this moment, at this hour, and for all time to come, I should oppose the organization or the settlement of that territory unless my constituents and the constituents of the whole South—of the slave states of the Union—could go into it upon the

same footing, with equal rights and equal privileges, carrying that species of property with them, as other people of this Union. Yes, sir, I acknowledged that that would have governed me, but I have no hope that the restriction will ever be repealed.

"I have always been of opinion that the first great error committed in the political history of this country was the ordinance of 1787, rendering the Northwest territory free territory. The next great error was the Missouri compromise. But they are both irremediable. There is no remedy for them. We must submit to them. I am prepared to do it. It is evident that the Missouri compromise cannot be repealed. So far as that question is concerned we might as well agree to the admission of this territory now as next year or five or ten years hence."

That, sir, is the speech of the senator from Missouri [Mr. Atchison], whose authority I think must go for something upon this question. What does he say? "When I came to look into that question"—of the possible repeal of the Missouri prohibition—that was the question he was looking into—"I found that there was no prospect, no hope of a repeal of the Missouri compromise excluding slavery from that territory." And yet, sir, at that very moment, according to this new doctrine of the senator from Illinois, it had been repealed three years!

Well, the senator from Missouri said further that if he thought it possible to oppose this restriction successfully he never would consent to the organization of the territory until it was rescinded. "But," said he, "I acknowledge that I have no hope that the restriction will ever be repealed." Then he made some complaint, as other Southern gentlemen have frequently done, of the ordinance of 1787 and the Missouri prohibition; but went on to say: "They are both irremediable. There is no remedy for them. We must submit to them. I am prepared to do it. It is evident that the Missouri compromise cannot be repealed."

Now, sir, when was this said? It was on the morning of the fourth of March, just before the close of the last session, when that Nebraska bill, reported by the senator from Illinois, which proposed no repeal and suggested no supersedure, was under discussion. I think, sir, that all this shows pretty clearly that up to the very close of the last session of Congress nobody had ever thought of a repeal by supersedure. Then, what took place at the com-

mencement of the present session? The senator from Iowa early in December introduced a bill for the organization of the Territory of Nebraska. I believe it was the same bill which was under discussion here at the last session, line for line, word for word. If I am wrong, the senator will correct me.

Did the senator from Iowa then entertain the idea that the Missouri prohibition had been superseded? No, sir, neither he nor any other man here, so far as could be judged from any discussion or statement or remark, had received this notion.

Well, on the fourth day of January the committee on territories, through their chairman, the senator from Illinois, made a report on the territorial organization of Nebraska; and that report was accompanied by a bill. Now, sir, on that fourth day of January, just thirty days ago, did the committee on territories entertain the opinion that the compromise acts of 1850 superseded the Missouri prohibition? If they did, they were very careful to keep it to themselves. We will judge the committee by their own report. What do they say in that? In the first place, they describe the character of the controversy in respect to the territories acquired from Mexico.

They say that some believed that a Mexican law prohibiting slavery was in force there, while others claimed that the Mexican law became inoperative at the moment of acquisition, and that slaveholders could take their slaves into the territory and hold them there under the provisions of the Constitution. The territorial compromise acts, as the committee tell us, steered clear of these questions. They simply provided that the states organized out of these territories might come in with or without slavery, as they should elect, but did not affect the question whether slaves could or could not be introduced before the organization of state governments. That question was left entirely to judicial decision.

Well, sir, what did the committee propose to do with the Nebraska territory? In respect to that, as in respect to the Mexican territory, differences of opinion exist in relation to the introduction of slaves. There are Southern gentlemen who contend that notwithstanding the Missouri

prohibition they can take their slaves into the territory covered by it and hold them there by virtue of the Constitution. On the other hand, the great majority of the American people, North and South, believe the Missouri prohibition to be constitutional and effectual. Now, what did the committee propose? Did they propose to repeal the prohibition? Did they suggest that it had been superseded? Did they advance any idea of that kind? No, sir; this is their language:—

"Under this section, as in the case of the Mexican law in New Mexico and Utah, it is a disputed point whether slavery is prohibited in the Nebraska country by valid enactment. The decision of this question involves the constitutional power of Congress to pass laws prescribing and regulating the domestic institutions of the various territories of the Union. In the opinion of those eminent statesmen who hold that Congress is invested with no rightful authority to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the territories, the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri is null and void, while the prevailing sentiment in a large portion of the Union sustains the doctrine that the Constitution of the United States secures to every citizen an inalienable right to move into any of the territories with his property, of whatever kind and description, and to hold and enjoy the same under the sanction of law. Your committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into the discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850."

This language will bear repetition:—

"Your committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into the discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850."

And they go on to say:—

"Congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matters in controversy then, either by affirming or repealing the Mexican laws, or by an act declaratory of the true intent of the Constitution and the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the territories; so your committee are not prepared now to recommend a departure from the course pursued on that memorable occasion, either by affirming or repealing the eighth section of the Missouri

SALMON PORTLAND CHASE

Photogravure after an etching

NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

act, or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the Constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute."

Mr. President, here are very remarkable facts. The committee on territories declared that it was not wise, that it was not prudent, that it was not right to renew the old controversy and to arouse agitation. They declared that they would abstain from any recommendation of a repeal of the prohibition or of any provision declaratory of the construction of the Constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who suppose that the question between Mexican law and the slaveholding claims was avoided in the Utah and New Mexico act; nor do I think that the introduction into the Nebraska bill of the provisions of those acts in respect to slavery would leave the question between the Missouri prohibition and the same slaveholding claims entirely unaffected. I am of a very different opinion. But I am dealing now with the report of the senator from Illinois, as chairman of the committee, and I show beyond all controversy that that report gave no countenance whatever to the doctrine of repeal by supersedure.

Well, sir, the bill reported by the committee was printed in the "Washington Sentinel" on Saturday, January 7th. It contained twenty sections, no more, no less. It contained no provisions in respect to slavery except those in the Utah and New Mexico bills. It left those provisions to speak for themselves. This was in harmony with the report of the committee. On the tenth of January—on Tuesday—the act appeared again in the "Sentinel"; but it had grown longer during the interval. It appeared now with twenty-one sections. There was a statement in the paper that the twenty-first section had been omitted by a clerical error.

But, sir, it is a singular fact that this twenty-first section is entirely out of harmony with the committee's report. It undertakes to determine the effect of the provision in the Utah and New Mexico bills. It declares, among other things, that all questions pertaining to slavery in the territories and in the new states to be formed therefrom are to

be left to the decision of the people residing therein through their appropriate representatives. This provision in effect repealed the Missouri prohibition, which the committee in their report declared ought not to be done. Is it possible, sir, that this was a mere clerical error? May it not be that this twenty-first section was the fruit of some Sunday work between Saturday the seventh and Tuesday the tenth?

But, sir, the addition of this section, it seems, did not help the bill. It did not, I suppose, meet the approbation of Southern gentlemen, who contended that they have a right to take their slaves into the territories notwithstanding any prohibition either by Congress or by a territorial legislature. I dare say it was found that the votes of these gentlemen could not be had for the bill with that clause in it. It was not enough that the committee had abandoned their report and had added this twenty-first section, in direct contravention of its reasonings and principles. The twenty-first section itself must be abandoned and the repeal of the Missouri prohibition placed in a shape which would not deny the slaveholding claim.

The senator from Kentucky [Mr. Dixon], on the sixteenth of January, submitted an amendment which came square up to repeal and to the claim. That amendment probably produced some fluttering and some consultation. It met the views of Southern senators, and probably determined the shape which the bill has finally assumed. Of the various mutations which it has undergone, I can hardly be mistaken in attributing the last to the amendment of the senator from Kentucky. That there is no effect without a cause is among our earliest lessons in physical philosophy, and I know of no causes which will account for the remarkable changes which the bill underwent after the sixteenth of January, other than that amendment and the determination of Southern senators to support it, and to vote against any provision recognizing the right of any territorial legislature to prohibit the introduction of slavery.

It was just seven days, Mr. President, after the senator from Kentucky had offered his amendment that a fresh amendment was reported from the committee on territories, in the shape of a new bill enlarged to forty sections. This new bill cuts off from the proposed territory half a

degree of latitude on the south, and divides the residue into two territories—the southern territory of Kansas and the northern territory of Nebraska. It applies to each all the provisions of the Utah and New Mexico bills; it rejects entirely the twenty-first clerical-error section and abrogates the Missouri prohibition by the very singular provision which I will read:—

"The Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said territory of Nebraska as elsewhere within the United States, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March 6, 1820, which was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the compromise measures, and is therefore declared inoperative."

Doubtless, Mr. President, this provision operates as a repeal of the prohibition. The senator from Kentucky was right when he said it was in effect the equivalent of his amendment. Those who are willing to break up and destroy the old compact of 1820 can vote for this bill with full assurance that such will be its effect. But I appeal to them not to vote for this supersedure clause. I ask them not to incorporate into the legislation of the country a declaration which every one knows to be wholly untrue. I have said that this doctrine of supersedure is new. I have now proved that it is a plant of but ten days' growth. It was never seen or heard of until the twenty-third day of January, 1854. It was upon that day that this tree of upas was planted; we already see its poison fruits.

The provision I have quoted abrogates the Missouri prohibition. It asserts no right in the territorial legislature to prohibit slavery. . . .

The truth is that the compromise acts of 1850 were not intended to introduce any principles of territorial organization applicable to any other territory except that covered by them. The professed object of the friends of the compromise acts was to compose the whole slavery agitation. There were various matters of complaint. The non-surrender of fugitives from service was one. The existence of slavery and the slave trade here in this district and elsewhere, under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, was

another. The apprehended introduction of slavery into the territories furnished other grounds of controversy. The slave states complained of the free states, and the free states complained of the slave states. It was supposed by some that this whole agitation might be stayed and finally put at rest by skilfully adjusted legislation. So, sir, we had the Omnibus bill and its appendages, the Fugitive Slave bill, and the District Slave Trade Suppression bill. To please the North—to please the free states—California was to be admitted and the slave depots here in the district were to be broken up. To please the slave states a stringent fugitive slave act was to be passed and slavery was to have a chance to get into the new territories. The support of the senators and representatives from Texas was to be gained by a liberal adjustment of boundary and by the assumption of a large portion of their state debt.

The general result contemplated was a complete and final adjustment of all questions relating to slavery.

The acts passed. A number of the friends of the acts signed a compact pledging themselves to support no man for any office who would in any way renew the agitation. The country was required to acquiesce in the settlement as an absolute finality. No man concerned in carrying those measures through Congress, and least of all the distinguished man whose efforts mainly contributed to their success, ever imagined that in the territorial acts, which formed a part of the series, they were planting the germs of a new agitation. Indeed, I have proved that one of these acts contained an express stipulation which precludes the revival of the agitation in the form in which it is now thrust upon the country, without manifest disregard of the provisions of those acts themselves.

I have thus proved beyond controversy that the averment of the bill which my amendment proposes to strike out is untrue. Senators, will you unite in a statement which you know to be contradicted by the history of the country? Will you incorporate into a public statute an affirmation which is contradicted by every event which attended or followed the adoption of the compromise acts? Will you here, acting under your high responsibility as senators of the states, assert as a fact, by a solemn vote,

that which the personal recollection of every senator who was here during the discussion of those compromise acts disproves?

I will not believe it until I see it. If you wish to break up the time-honored compact embodied in the Missouri compromise, transferred into the joint resolution for the annexation of Texas, preserved and affirmed by these compromise acts themselves, do it openly—do it boldly. Repeal the Missouri prohibition. Repeal it by a direct vote. Do not repeal it by indirection. Do not "declare" it "inoperative," "because superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850."

Mr. President, three great eras have marked the history of this country in respect to slavery. The first may be characterized as the "era of enfranchisement." It commenced with the earliest struggles for national independence. The spirit which inspired it animated the hearts and prompted the efforts of Washington, of Jefferson, of Patrick Henry, of Wythe, of Adams, of Jay, of Hamilton, of Morris —in short, of all the great men of our early history.

All these hoped for, all these labored for, all these believed in, the final deliverance of the country from the curse of slavery. That spirit burned in the Declaration of Independence and inspired the provisions of the Constitution and the ordinance of 1787.

Under its influence, when in full vigor, state after state provided for the emancipation of the slaves within their limits prior to the adoption of the Constitution. Under its feebler influence at a later period, and during the administration of Mr. Jefferson, the importation of slaves was prohibited into Mississippi and Louisiana in the faint hope that those territories might finally become free states. Gradually that spirit ceased to influence our public councils and lost its control over the American heart and the American policy. Another era succeeded, but by such imperceptible gradations that the lines which separate the two cannot be traced with absolute precision. The facts of the two eras meet and mingle as the currents of confluent streams mix so imperceptibly that the observer cannot fix the spot where the meeting waters blend.

This second era was the "era of conservatism." Its

great maxim was to preserve the existing conditions. Men said: Let things remain as they are; let slavery stand where it is; exclude where it is not; refrain from disturbing the public quiet by agitation; adjust all difficulties that arise, not by the application of principles, but by compromises.

It was during this period that the senator tells us that slavery was maintained in Illinois, both while a territory and after it became a state, in despite of the provisions of the ordinance. It is true, sir, that the slaves held in the Illinois country under the French law were not regarded as absolutely emancipated by the provisions of the ordinance. But full effect was given to the ordinance in excluding the introduction of slaves, and thus the territory was preserved from eventually becoming a slave state. The few slaveholders in the Territory of Indiana, which then included Illinois, succeeded in obtaining such an ascendency in its affairs that repeated applications were made, not merely by conventions of delegates, but by the territorial legislature itself, for suspension of the clause in the ordinance prohibiting slavery. These applications were reported upon by John Randolph of Virginia in the House and by Mr. Franklin in the Senate. Both the reports were against suspension. The grounds stated by Randolph are specially worthy of being considered now. They are thus stated in the report:—

> "That the committee deem it highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair a provision wisely calculated to promote the happiness and prosperity of the Northwestern country, and to give strength and security to that extensive frontier. In the salutary operation of this sagacious and benevolent restraint it is believed that the inhabitants of Indiana will at no very distant day find ample remuneration for a temporary privation of labor and of emigration."

Sir, these reports, made in 1803 and 1807, and the action of Congress upon them in conformity with their recommendation, saved Illinois, and perhaps Indiana, from becoming slave states. When the people of Illinois formed their state constitution they incorporated into it a section providing that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall hereafter be introduced into this state. The constitution made provision for the continued service of the few persons

who were originally held as slaves and then bound to service under the territorial laws, and for the freedom of their children, and thus secured the final extinction of slavery. The senator thinks that this result is not attributable to the ordinance. I differ from him. But for the ordinance I have no doubt slavery would have been introduced into Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio. It is something to the credit of the "era of conservatism," uniting its influences with those of the expiring "era of enfranchisement," that it maintained the ordinance of 1787 in the Northwest.

The "era of conservatism" passed, also by imperceptible gradations, into the "era of slavery propagandism." Under the influences of this new spirit we opened the whole territory acquired from Mexico, except California, to the ingress of slavery. Every foot of it was covered by a Mexican prohibition; and yet by the legislation of 1850 we consented to expose it to the introduction of slaves. Some, I believe, have actually been carried into Utah and New Mexico. They may be few, perhaps, but a few are enough to affect materially the probable character of their future governments. Under the evil influences of the same spirit we are now called upon to reverse the original policy of the republic, to support even a solemn compact of the conservative period, and open Nebraska to slavery.

Sir, I believe that we are upon the verge of another era. That era will be the "era of reaction." The introduction of this question here and its discussion will greatly hasten its advent. We who insist upon the denationalization of slavery, and upon the absolute divorce of the general government from all connection with it, will stand with the men who favored the compromise acts and who yet wish to adhere to them in their letter and in their spirit against the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. But you may pass it here. You may send it to the other house. It may become a law.

But its effect will be to satisfy all thinking men that no compromises with slavery will endure except so long as they serve the interests of slavery; and that there is no safe and honorable ground for the non-slaveholders to stand upon, except that of restricting slavery within state limits and excluding it absolutely from the whole sphere of federal

jurisdiction. The old questions between political parties are at rest. No great question so thoroughly possesses the public mind as this of slavery. This discussion will hasten the inevitable reorganization of parties upon the new issues which our circumstances suggest. It will light up a fire in the country which may, perhaps, consume those who kindle it.

I cannot believe that the people of this country have so far lost sight of the maxims and principles of the Revolution, or are so insensible to the obligations which those maxims and principles impose, as to acquiesce in the violation of this compact.

EARL OF CHATHAM

THE RIGHT OF TAXING AMERICA

[William Pitt, first Earl of Chatham, an English orator and statesman, was born in London in 1708. He studied at Oxford and entered the army, from which he was dismissed for personally offending the king. He had been chosen to the House of Commons prior to this, and now chose a career in public life, taking the side of the Prince of Wales, who was at odds with his father. Chatham (as yet known simply under his commoner's name of William Pitt) became a popular man owing to his eloquence and ability, and in 1757 was placed at the head of the government, to the king's chagrin. The new administration waged a brilliantly successful foreign war, but the premier lost power when George III. came to the throne. The ousted minister was some years later invited to return, when he was made Viscount Pitt and Earl of Chatham. His subsequent career was as successful as many had expected it would be, and he retired in a year or two, not to reappear conspicuously as a public man until he rose from his sick bed and made a memorable speech in the House of Lords in opposition to the recognition of American independence. The strain of this effort brought on a fit which interrupted his remarks. He had to be carried from his seat, and in a few weeks he died (1778). The following speech, which won him friends in America and enemies in England, was made in the House of Commons, 1766.]

MR. SPEAKER: I came to town but to-day. I was a stranger to the tenor of his majesty's speech and the proposed address till I heard them read in this house. Unconnected and unconsulted, I have not the means of information. I am fearful of offending through mistake, and therefore beg to be indulged with a second reading of the proposed address. [The address being read, Mr. Pitt went on]: I commend the king's speech, and approve of the address in answer, as it decides nothing, every gentleman being left at perfect liberty to take such a part concerning America as he may afterward see fit. One word

only I cannot approve of—an "early" is a word that does not belong to the notice the ministry have given to Parliament of the troubles in America. In a matter of such importance the communication ought to have been immediate.

I speak not now with respect to parties. I stand up in this place single and independent. As to the late ministry [turning himself to Mr. Grenville, who sat within one of him], every capital measure they have taken has been entirely wrong! As to the present gentlemen, to those at least whom I have in my eye [looking at the bench where General Conway sat with the lords of the treasury], I have no objection. I have never been made a sacrifice by any of them. Their characters are fair, and I am always glad when men of fair character engage in his majesty's service. Some of them did me the honor to ask my opinion before they would engage. These will now do me the justice to own I advised them to do it; but, notwithstanding (for I love to be explicit), I cannot give them my confidence. Pardon me, gentlemen [bowing to the ministry], confidence is a plant of slow growth in an aged bosom. Youth is the season of credulity. By comparing events with each other, reasoning from effects to causes, methinks I plainly discover the traces of an overruling influence.

There is a clause in the Act of Settlement obliging every minister to sign his name to the advice which he gives to his sovereign. Would it were observed! I have had the honor to serve the crown, and if I could have submitted to influence, I might have still continued to serve; but I would not be responsible for others. I have no local attachments. It is indifferent to me whether a man was rocked in his cradle on this side or that side of the Tweed. I sought for merit wherever it was to be found. It is my boast that I was the first minister who looked for it, and found it, in the mountains of the north. I called it forth, and drew into your service a hardy and intrepid race of men—men who, when left by your jealousy, became a prey to the artifices of your enemies, and had gone nigh to have overturned the state in the war before the last. These men, in the last war, were brought to combat on your side. They served with fidelity, as they fought with valor, and conquered for

you in every part of the world. Detested be the national reflections against them! They are unjust, groundless, illiberal, unmanly! When I ceased to serve his majesty as a minister, it was not the country of the man by which I was moved—but the man of that country wanted wisdom, and held principles incompatible with freedom.

It is a long time, Mr. Speaker, since I have attended in Parliament. When the resolution was taken in this house to tax America, I was ill in bed. If I could have endured to be carried in my bed—so great was the agitation of my mind for the consequences—I would have solicited some kind hand to have laid me down on this floor, to have borne my testimony against it. It is now an act that has passed. I would speak with decency of every act of this house, but I must beg the indulgence of the House to speak of it with freedom.

I hope a day may soon be appointed to consider the state of the nation with respect to America. I hope gentlemen will come to this debate with all the temper and impartiality that his majesty recommends and the importance of the subject requires; a subject of greater importance than ever engaged the attention of this house—that subject only excepted when, near a century ago, it was the question whether you yourselves were to be bond or free. In the meantime, as I cannot depend upon my health for any future day (such is the nature of my infirmities), I will beg to say a few words at present, leaving the justice, the equity, the policy, the expediency of the act to another time.

I will only speak to one point, a point which seems not to have been generally understood—I mean to the right. Some gentlemen [alluding to Mr. Nugent] seem to have considered it as a point of honor. If gentlemen consider it in that light, they leave all measures of right and wrong to follow a delusion that may lead to destruction. It is my opinion that this kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the colonies. At the same time, I assert the authority of this kingdom over the colonies to be sovereign and supreme in every circumstance of government and legislation whatsoever. They are the subjects of this kingdom, equally entitled with yourselves to all the natural rights of mankind

and the peculiar privileges of Englishmen; equally bound by its laws, and equally participating in the constitution of this free country. The Americans are the sons, not the bastards of England. Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power. The taxes are a voluntary gift and grant of the commons alone. In legislation the three estates of the realm are alike concerned; but the concurrence of the peers and the crown to a tax is only necessary to clothe it with the form of a law. The gift and grant is of the commons alone. In ancient days the crown, the barons, and the clergy possessed the lands. In those days the barons and the clergy gave and granted to the crown. They gave and granted what was their own. At present, since the discovery of America, and other circumstances permitting, the commons are become the proprietors of the land. The church (God bless it!) has but a pittance. The property of the lords, compared with that of the commons, is as a drop of water in the ocean; and this house represents those commons, the proprietors of the lands, and those proprietors virtually represent the rest of the inhabitants. When, therefore, in this house, we give and grant, we give and grant what is our own. But in an American tax, what do we do? "We, your majesty's commons for Great Britain, give and grant to your majesty"—what? Our own property? No! "We give and grant to your majesty" the property of your majesty's commons of America! It is an absurdity in terms.

The distinction between legislation and taxation is essentially necessary to liberty. The crown and the peers are equally legislative powers with the commons. If taxation be a part of simple legislation, the crown and the peers have rights in taxation as well as yourselves—rights which they will claim, which they will exercise, whenever the principle can be supported by power.

There is an idea in some that the colonies are virtually represented in the House. I would fain know by whom an American is represented here. Is he represented by any knight of the shire, in any county in this kingdom? Would to God that respectable representation was augmented to a greater number. Or will you tell him that he is represented by any representative of a borough?—a borough

which, perhaps, its own representatives never saw. This is what is called the rotten part of the constitution. It cannot continue a century. If it does not drop, it must be amputated. The idea of a virtual representation of America in this house is the most contemptible idea that ever entered into the head of a man. It does not deserve a serious refutation.

The commons of America, represented in their several assemblies, have ever been in possession of the exercise of this their constitutional right of giving and granting their own money. They would have been slaves if they had not enjoyed it. At the same time, this kingdom, as the supreme governing and legislative power, has always bound the colonies by her laws, by her regulations, and restrictions in trade, in navigation, in manufactures, in everything except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent.

Here I would draw the line—

"Quam ultra citraque neque consistere rectum."*

[When Lord Chatham had concluded, General Conway rose, and avowed his complete approval of that part of the previous speech which related to American affairs, but denied altogether that "secret overruling influence which had been hinted at." Mr. George Grenville also spoke on the tumults and riots which had taken place in the colonies, and declared that they bordered on rebellion.] I cannot [said Mr. Grenville] understand the difference between external and internal taxes. They are the same in effect, and differ only in name. That this kingdom has the sovereign, the supreme legislative power over America, is granted; it cannot be denied; and taxation is a part of that sovereign power. It is one branch of the legislation. It is, it has been, exercised over those who are not, who were never represented. It is exercised over the India Company, the merchants of London, the proprietors of the stocks, and over many great manufacturing towns. It was exercised over the county palatine of Chester and the bishopric of Durham before they sent any representatives to Parlia-

* "On neither side of which we can rightly stand."

ment. I appeal for proof to the preambles of the acts which gave them representatives: one in the reign of Henry VIII., the other in that of Charles II. [Mr. Grenville then quoted the acts, and desired that they might be read; which being done, he said]: When I proposed to tax America, I asked the House if any gentleman would object to the right; I repeatedly asked it, and no man would attempt to deny it. Protection and obedience are reciprocal. Great Britain protects America; America is bound to yield obedience. If not, tell me when the Americans were emancipated. When they want the protection of this kingdom, they are always very ready to ask it. That protection has always been afforded them in the most full and ample manner. The nation has run herself into an immense debt to give them their protection; and now, when they are called upon to contribute a small share toward the public expense—an expense arising from themselves—they renounce your authority, insult your officers, and break out, I might almost say, into open rebellion. The seditious spirit of the colonies owes its birth to the factions in this house. Gentlemen are careless of the consequences of what they say, provided it answers the purposes of opposition. We were told we trod on tender ground. We were bid to expect disobedience. What is this but telling the Americans to stand out against the law, to encourage their obstinacy with the expectation of support from hence? "Let us only hold out a little," they would say; "our friends will soon be in power." Ungrateful people of America! Bounties have been extended to them. When I had the honor of serving the crown, while you yourselves were loaded with an enormous debt, you gave bounties on their lumber, on their iron, their hemp, and many other articles. You have relaxed in their favor the Act of Navigation, that palladium of the British commerce; and yet I have been abused in all the public papers as an enemy to the trade of America. I have been particularly charged with giving orders and instructions to prevent the Spanish trade, and thereby stopping the channel by which alone North America used to be supplied with cash for remittances to this country. I defy any man to produce any such orders or instructions. I discouraged no trade but what was illicit, what

was prohibited by an act of Parliament. I desire a West India merchant [Mr. Long] well known in the city, a gentleman of character, may be examined. He will tell you that I offered to do everything in my power to advance the trade of America. I was above giving an answer to anonymous calumnies; but in this place it becomes one to wipe off the aspersion.

[Here Mr. Grenville stopped, and Pitt was clamorously called upon to speak.]

Mr. Pitt said: I do not apprehend I am speaking twice. I did expressly reserve a part of my subject, in order to save the time of this house; but I am compelled to proceed in it. I do not speak twice; I only finish what I designedly left imperfect. But if the House is of a different opinion, far be it from me to indulge a wish of transgression against order. I am content, if it be your pleasure, to be silent. [Here he paused. The House resounding with "Go on! go on!" he proceeded]:—

Gentlemen, sir, have been charged with giving birth to sedition in America. They have spoken their sentiments with freedom against this unhappy act, and that freedom has become their crime. Sorry I am to hear the liberty of speech in this house imputed as a crime. But the imputation shall not discourage me. It is a liberty I mean to exercise. No gentleman ought to be afraid to exercise it. It is a liberty by which the gentleman who calumniates it might have profited. He ought to have desisted from his project. The gentleman tells us America is obstinate; America is almost in open rebellion. I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people, so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest. I come not here armed at all points with law cases and acts of Parliament, with the statute book doubled down in dogs' ears, to defend the cause of liberty. If I had, I myself would have cited the two cases of Chester and Durham. I would have cited them to show that, even under former arbitrary reigns, parliaments were ashamed of taxing a people without their consent, and allowed them representatives. Why did the gentleman confine himself to Chester and Durham? He might have taken a higher example in

Wales—Wales, that never was taxed by Parliament till it was incorporated. I would not debate a particular point of law with the gentleman. I know his abilities. I have been obliged to his diligent researches. But, for the defense of liberty, upon a general principle, upon a constitutional principle, it is a ground on which I stand firm—on which I dare meet any man. The gentleman tells us of many who are taxed, and are not represented—the India Company, merchants, stockholders, manufacturers. Surely many of these are represented in other capacities, as owners of land or as freemen of boroughs. It is a misfortune that more are not equally represented. But they are all inhabitants, and, as such, are they not virtually represented? Many have it in their option to be actually represented. They have connections with those that elect, and they have influence over them. The gentleman mentioned the stockholders. I hope he does not reckon the debts of the nation as a part of the national estate.

Since the accession of King William many ministers, some of great, others of more moderate abilities, have taken the lead of government. [Here Mr. Pitt went through the list of them, bringing it down till he came to himself, giving a short sketch of the characters of each, and then proceeded]: None of these thought, or even dreamed of robbing the colonies of their constitutional rights. That was reserved to mark the era of the late administration. Not that there were wanting some, when I had the honor to serve his majesty, to propose to me to burn my fingers with an American stamp act. With the enemy at their back, with our bayonets at their breasts, in the day of their distress, perhaps the Americans would have submitted to the imposition; but it would have been taking an ungenerous, an unjust advantage. The gentleman boasts of his bounties to America. Are not these bounties intended finally for the benefit of this kingdom? If they are not, he has misapplied the national treasures.

I am no courtier of America. I stand up for this kingdom. I maintain that the Parliament has a right to bind, to restrain America. Our legislative power over the colonies is sovereign and supreme. When it ceases to be sovereign and supreme, I would advise every gentleman to

sell his lands, if he can, and embark for that country. When two countries are connected together like England and her colonies, without being incorporated, the one must necessarily govern. The greater must rule the less. But she must so rule it as not to contradict the fundamental principles that are common to both.

If the gentleman does not understand the difference between external and internal taxes, I cannot help it. There is a plain distinction between taxes levied for the purposes of raising a revenue, and duties imposed for the regulation of trade, for the accommodation of the subject; although, in the consequences, some revenue may incidentally arise from the latter.

The gentleman asks, when were the colonies emancipated? I desire to know, when were they made slaves? But I dwell not upon words. When I had the honor of serving his majesty, I availed myself of the means of information which I derived from my office. I speak, therefore, from knowledge. My materials were good. I was at pains to collect, to digest, to consider them; and I will be bold to affirm that the profits to Great Britain from the trade of the colonies, through all its branches, is two millions a year. This is the fund that carried you triumphantly through the last war. The estates that were rented at two thousand pounds a year threescore years ago, are at three thousand at present. Those estates sold then from fifteen to eighteen years' purchase; the same may now be sold for thirty. You owe this to America. This is the price America pays you for her protection. And shall a miserable financier come with a boast that he can bring "a peppercorn" into the exchequer by the loss of millions to the nation? I dare not say how much higher these profits may be augmented. Omitting the immense increase of people, by natural population, in the northern colonies, and the emigration from every part of Europe, I am convinced (on other grounds) that the commercial system of America may be altered to advantage. You have prohibited where you ought to have encouraged. You have encouraged where you ought to have prohibited. Improper restraints have been laid on the continent in favor of the islands. You have but two nations to trade with in America. Would

you had twenty! Let acts of Parliament in consequence of treaties remain; but let not an English minister become a custom-house officer for Spain, or for any foreign power. Much is wrong. Much may be amended for the general good of the whole. Does the gentleman complain he has been misrepresented in the public prints? It is a common misfortune. In the Spanish affair of the last war, I was abused in all the newspapers for having advised his majesty to violate the laws of nations with regard to Spain. The abuse was industriously circulated even in handbills. If administration did not propagate the abuse, administration never contradicted it. I will not say what advice I did give the king. My advice is in writing, signed by myself, in the possession of the crown. But I will say what advice I did not give to the king. I did not advise him to violate any of the laws of nations.

As to the report of the gentleman's preventing in some way the trade for bullion with the Spaniards, it was spoken of so confidently that I own I am one of those who did believe it to be true.

The gentleman must not wonder he was not contradicted when, as minister, he asserted the right of Parliament to tax America. I know not how it is, but there is a modesty in this house which does not choose to contradict a minister. Even your chair, sir, looks too often toward St. James's. I wish gentlemen would get the better of this modesty. If they do not, perhaps the collective body may begin to abate of its respect for the representative. Lord Bacon has told me that a great question would not fail of being agitated at one time or another. I was willing to agitate such a question at the proper season, viz., that of the German war—*my* German war, they called it! Every session I called out, Has anybody any objection to the German war? Nobody would object to it, one gentleman only excepted, since removed to the upper house by succession to an ancient barony [Lord le Despencer, formerly Sir Francis Dashwood]. He told me he did not like a German war. I honored the man for it, and was sorry when he was turned out of his post.

A great deal has been said without doors of the power, of the strength of America. It is a topic that ought to be

cautiously meddled with. In a good cause, on a sound bottom, the force of this country can crush America to atoms. I know the valor of your troops. I know the skill of your officers. There is not a company of foot that has served in America, out of which you may not pick a man of sufficient knowledge and experience to make a governor of a colony there. But on this ground, on the Stamp Act, which so many here will think a crying injustice, I am one who will lift up my hands against it.

In such a cause your success would be hazardous. America, if she fell, would fall like a strong man; she would embrace the pillars of the state, and pull down the constitution along with her. Is this your boasted peace—not to sheathe the sword in its scabbard, but to sheathe it in the bowels of your countrymen? Will you quarrel with yourselves, now the whole house of Bourbon is united against you; while France disturbs your fisheries in Newfoundland, embarrasses your slave trade to Africa, and withholds from your subjects in Canada their property stipulated by treaty; while the ransom for the Manilas is denied by Spain, and its gallant conqueror basely traduced into a mean plunderer! —a gentleman [Colonel Draper] whose noble and generous spirit would do honor to the proudest grandee of the country? The Americans have not acted in all things with prudence and temper; they have been wronged; they have been driven to madness by injustice. Will you punish them for the madness you have occasioned? Rather let prudence and temper come first from this side. I will undertake for America that she will follow the example. There are two lines in a ballad of Prior's, of a man's behavior to his wife, so applicable to you and your colonies that I cannot help repeating them:

> "Be to her faults a little blind;
> Be to her virtues very kind."

Upon the whole, I will beg leave to tell the House what is my opinion. It is, that the Stamp Act be repealed absolutely, totally, and immediately. That the reason for the repeal be assigned, viz., because it was founded on an erroneous principle. At the same time, let the sovereign

authority of this country over the colonies be asserted in as strong terms as can be devised, and be made to extend to every point of legislation whatsoever: that we may bind their trade, confine their manufactures, and exercise every power whatsoever, except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent.

RUFUS CHOATE

THE PRESERVATION OF THE UNION

[Rufus Choate, a lawyer first and foremost, though engaging for brief periods in the field of politics, was born at Essex, Mass., October 1, 1799. He was educated at Dartmouth, from which he graduated as valedictorian. He subsequently entered the law school at Cambridge, and was admitted to the bar in 1823. In 1825 he entered the state legislature, and five years later was sent to the House of Representatives. When Daniel Webster retired from the Senate to accept the offer of secretary of state under President Harrison, Rufus Choate was elected by Massachusetts to fill the vacant place. Here he made speeches on the subjects of the Oregon boundary, the tariff, the fiscal bank bill, the Smithsonian Institution, and the annexation of Texas, which he opposed. After 1845 he retired from the Senate, and remained out of office save for his service in the constitutional convention of Massachusetts in 1853. In 1859 he hoped to benefit his failing health by a journey to Europe; but after proceeding as far as Halifax he was obliged to disembark, and he lingered but a few days, dying on the thirteenth of July. This well-known speech on the preservation of the Union is full of the fire of patriotism, and was delivered at Faneuil Hall, Boston, in 1850.]

I FEEL it, fellow citizens, to be quite needless, for any purpose of affecting your votes now, or your judgment and acts for the future, that I should add a word to the resolutions before you, and to the able addresses by which they have been explained and enforced. All that I would have said has been better said. In all that I would have suggested, this great assembly, so true and ample a representation of the sobriety and principle and business and patriotism of this city and its vicinity—if I may judge from the manner in which you have responded to the sentiments of preceding speakers—has far outrun me. In all that I had felt and reflected on the supreme importance of this deliberation, on the reality and urgency of the peril, on the

indispensable necessity which exists that an effort be made, and made at once, combining the best counsels, and the wisest and most decisive action of the community—an effort to turn away men's thoughts from those things which concern this part or that part, to those which concern the whole of our America—to turn away men's solicitude about the small politics that shall give a state administration this year to one set and the next year to another set, and fix it on the grander politics by which a nation is to be held together —to turn away men's hearts from loving one brother of the national household, and hating and reviling another, to that larger, juster, and wiser affection which folds the whole household to its bosom—to turn away men's conscience and sense of moral obligation from the morbid and mad pursuit of a single duty, and indulgence of a single sentiment, to the practical ethics in which all duties are recognized, by which all duties are reconciled and adjusted and subordinated according to their rank, by which the sacredness of compacts is holden to be as real as the virtue of compassion, and the supremacy of the law declared as absolute as the luxury of a tear is felt to be sweet—to turn away men's eyes from the glare of the lights of a philanthropy (they call it philanthropy) some of whose ends may be specious, but whose means are bad faith, abusive speech, ferocity of temper, and resistance to law; and whose fruit, if it ripens to fruit, will be woes unnumbered to bond and free—to turn all eyes from the glitter of such light to the steady and unalterable glory of that wisdom, that justice, and that best philanthropy under which the states of America have been enabled and may still be enabled to live together in peace, and grow together into the nature of one people—in all that I had felt and reflected on these things, you have outrun my warmest feelings and my best thoughts. What remains, then, but that I congratulate you on at least this auspicious indication, and take my leave? One or two suggestions, however, you will pardon to the peculiarity of the times.

I concur, then, *first*, fellow citizens, with one of the resolutions, in expressing my sincerest conviction that the Union is in extreme peril this day. Some good and wise men, I know, do not see this; and some not quite so

good or wise deny that they see it. I know very well that to sound a false alarm is a shallow and contemptible thing. But I know, also, that too much precaution is safer than too little, and I believe that less than the utmost is too little now. Better, it is said, to be ridiculed for too much care than to be ruined by too confident a security. I have, then, a profound conviction that the Union is yet in danger. It is true that it has passed through one peril within the last few months—such a peril that the future historian of America will pause with astonishment and terror when he comes to record it. The sobriety of the historic style will rise to eloquence, to pious ejaculation, to thanksgivings to Almighty God, as he sketches that scene and the virtues that triumphed in it. "Honor and praise," will he exclaim, "to the eminent men of all parties—to Clay, to Cass, to Foote, to Dickinson, to Webster—who rose that day to the measure of a true greatness—who remembered that they had a country to preserve as well as a local constituency to gratify—who laid all the wealth and all the hopes of illustrious lives on the altar of a hazardous patriotism—who reckoned all the sweets of a present popularity for nothing in comparison of that more exceeding weight of glory which follows him who seeks to compose an agitated and save a sinking land."

That night is passed, and that peril; and yet it is still night, and there is peril still. And what do I mean by this? I believe, and rejoice to believe, that the general judgment of the people is yet sound on this transcendent subject. But I will tell you where I think the danger lies. It is, that while the people sleep, politicians and philanthropists of the legislative hall, the stump, and the press, will talk and write us out of our Union. Yes, while you sleep, while the merchant is loading his ships, and the farmer is gathering his harvests, and the music of the hammer and shuttle wake around, and we are all steeped in the enjoyment of that vast and various good which a common government places within our reach. There are influences that never sleep, and which are creating and diffusing a PUBLIC OPINION in whose hot and poisoned breath, before we yet perceive our evil plight, this Union may melt as frostwork in the sun. Do we sufficiently appreciate how

omnipotent is opinion in the matter of all government? Do we consider especially in how true a sense it is the creator, must be the upholder, and may be the destroyer of our united government? Do we often enough advert to the distinction, that while our state governments must exist almost of necessity, and with no effort from within or without, the UNION of the states is a totally different creation—more delicate, more artificial, more recent, far more truly a mere production of the reason and the will—standing in far more need of an ever-surrounding care to preserve and repair it and urge it along its highway? Do we reflect that while the people of Massachusetts, for example, are in all sense one—not *e pluribus unum*, but one single and uncompounded substance, so to speak—and while every influence that can possibly help to hold a social existence together: identity of interest, closeness of kindred, contiguity of place, old habit, the ten thousand opportunities of daily intercourse, everything is operating to hold such a state together, so that it must exist whether we will or not, and "cannot, but by annihilating, die"—the people of America compose a totally different community, a community miscellaneous and widely scattered; that they are many states, not one state, or, if one, made up of many which still coexist; that numerous influences of vast energy, influences of situation, of political creeds, of employments, of supposed or real diversities of material interest, tend evermore to draw them asunder; and that it is not, as in a single state, that instinct, custom, a long antiquity, closeness of kindred, immediate contiguity, the personal intercourse of daily life and the like, come in to make and consolidate the grand incorporation, whether we will or not; but that is to be accomplished by carefully cultivated and acquired habits and states of feeling; by an enlightened discernment of great interests, embracing a continent and a future age; by a voluntary determination to love, honor, and cherish, by mutual tolerance, by mutual indulgence of one another's peculiarities, by the most politic and careful withdrawal of our attention from the offensive particulars in which we differ, and by the most assiduous development and appreciation and contemplation of those things wherein we are alike—do we reflect as we ought that it is only thus—by

varieties of expedients, by a prolonged and voluntary educational process, that the fine and strong spirit of NATIONALITY may be made to penetrate and animate the scarcely congruous mass, and the full tide of American feeling to fill the mighty heart?

I have sometimes thought that the states in our system may be compared to the primordial particles of matter: indivisible, indestructible, impenetrable, whose natural condition is to repel each other, or, at least, to exist in their own independent identity, while the Union is an artificial aggregation of such particles; a sort of *forced state*, as some have said, of life; a complex structure made with hands, which gravity, attrition, time, rain, dew, frost, not less than tempest and earthquake, cooperate to waste away, and which the anger of a fool—or the laughter of a fool—may bring down in an hour; a system of bodies advancing slowly through a resisting medium, operating at all times to retard and at any moment liable to arrest its motion; a beautiful yet fragile creation, which a breath can unmake, as a breath has made it.

And now, charged with the trust of holding together such a nation as this, what have we seen? What do we see to-day? Exactly this. It has been for many months—years, I may say, but assuredly for a long season—the peculiar infelicity, say, rather, terrible misfortune of this country, that the attention of the people has been fixed, without the respite of a moment, exclusively on one of those subjects—the only one on which we disagree precisely according to geographical lines. And not so only, but this subject has been one—unlike tariff, or internal improvements, or the disbursement of the public money, on which the dispute cannot be maintained for an hour without heat of blood, mutual loss of respect, alienation of regard—menacing to end in hate strong and cruel as the grave.

I call this only a terrible misfortune. I blame here and now no man and no policy for it. Circumstances have forced it upon us all; and down to the hour that the series of compromise measures was completed and presented to the country, or certainly to Congress, I will not here and now say that it was the fault of one man, or one region of country, or one party more than another.

"But the pity of it, Iago—the pity of it!"

How appalling have been its effects; and how deep and damning will be his guilt who rejects the opportunity of reconcilement, and continues this accursed agitation, without necessity, for another hour!

Why, is there any man so bold or blind as to say he believes that the scenes through which we have been passing for a year have left the American heart where they found it? Does any man believe that those affectionate and respectful regards, that attachment and that trust, those "cords of love and bands of a man," which knit this people together as one in an earlier and better time, are as strong to-day as they were a year ago? Do you believe that there can have been so tremendous an apparatus of influences at work so long, some designed, some undesigned, but all at work in one way, that is, to make the two great divisions of the national family hate each other, and yet have no effect? Recall what we have seen in that time, and weigh it well. Consider how many hundreds of speeches were made in Congress—all to show how extreme and intrepid an advocate the speaker could be of the extreme Northern sentiment, or the extreme Southern sentiment. Consider how many scores of thousands of every one of those speeches were printed and circulated among the honorable member's constituents—not much elsewhere—the great mass of whom agreed with him perfectly, and was only made the more angry and more unreasonable by them. Consider what caballings and conspirings were going forward during that session in committee rooms and members' chambers, and think of their private correspondence with enterprising waiters on events. Turn to the American newspaper press, secular and religious—every editor, or how vast a proportion! transformed into a manufacturer of mere local opinion—local opinion—local opinion—working away at his battery—big or little—as if it were the most beautiful operation in the world to persuade one half of the people how unreasonable and how odious were the other half. Think of conventions sitting for secession and dismemberment by the very tomb of Jackson—the "buried majesty" not rising to scatter and blast them. Call to mind how many

elections have been holden—stirring the wave of the people to its profoundest depths—all turning on this topic. Remember how few of all who help to give direction to general sentiment, how few in either house of Congress, what a handful only of editors and preachers and talkers have ventured anywhere to breathe a word above a whisper to hush or divert the pelting of this pitiless storm; and then consider how delicate and sensitive a thing is public opinion, how easy it is to mold and color and kindle it, and yet that, when molded and colored and fired, not all the bayonets and artillery of Borodino can maintain the government which it decrees to perish; and say if you have not been encompassed, and are not now, by a peril awful indeed! Say if you believe it possible that a whole people can go on—a reading and excitable people—hearing nothing, reading nothing, talking of nothing, thinking of nothing, sleeping and waking on nothing, for a year, but one incessant and vehement appeal to the strongest of their passions—to the pride, anger, and fear of the South, to the philanthropy, humanity, and conscience of the North—one half of it aimed to persuade you that they were cruel, ambitious, indolent, and licentious, and therefore hateful; and the other half of it to persuade them that you were desperately and hypocritically fanatical and aggressive, and therefore hateful—say if an excitable people can go through all this, and not be the worse for it! I tell you nay. Such a year has sowed the seed of a harvest which, if not nipped in the bud, will grow to armed men, hating with the hate of the brothers of Thebes.

It seems to me as if our hearts were changing. Ties the strongest, influences the sweetest, seem falling asunder as smoking flax. I took up, the day before yesterday, a religious newspaper published in this city—a leading orthodox paper I may describe it, to avoid misapprehension. The first thing which met my eye was what purported to be an extract from a Southern religious newspaper, denouncing the Boston editor, or one of his contributors, as an infidel —in just so many words—on the ground that one of his antislavery arguments implied a doctrine inconsistent with a certain text of the New Testament. Surely, I said to myself, the Christian thus denounced will be deeply wounded

by such misconstruction; and as he lives a thousand miles away from slavery, as it really does not seem to be his business, as it neither picks his pocket nor breaks his leg, and he may, therefore, afford to be cool, while his Southern brother lives in the very heart of it, and may, naturally enough, be a little more sensitive, he will try to soothe him and win him, if he can, to reconsider and retract so grievous an objurgation. No such thing! To be called an infidel, says he, by this Southern Presbyterian, I count a real honor! He therefore proceeds to denounce the slaveholding South as a downright Sodom—leaves a pretty violent implication that his Presbyterian antagonist is not one of its few righteous, whoever else is—and without more ado sends him adrift. Yes, fellow citizens, more than the Methodist Episcopal Church is rent in twain. But if these things are done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? If the spirit of Christianity is not of power sufficient to enable its avowed professors to conduct this disputation of hatred with temper and decorum—to say nothing of charity—what may we expect from the hot blood of men who own not nor comprehend the law of love?

I have spoken what I think of the danger that threatens the Union. I have done so more at length than I could have wished, because I know that, upon the depth of our convictions and the sincerity of our apprehensions upon this subject, the views we shall take of our duties and responsibilities must all depend.

If you concur with me that there is danger, you will concur with me, in the *second place*, that thoughtful men have something to do to avert it; and what is that? It is not, in my judgment, fellow citizens, by stereotyped declamation on the utilities of the Union to South or North that we can avert the danger. It is not by shutting our eyes and ears to it that we can avert it. It is not by the foolish prattle of "Oh, those people off there need the Union more than we, and will not dare to quit." It is not by putting arms akimbo here or there and swearing that we will stand no more bullying, and if anybody has a mind to dissolve the Union, let him go ahead. Not thus, not thus, felt and acted that generation of our fathers who, out of distracted counsels, the keen jealousies of states, and a decaying

nationality, by patience and temper as admirable as their wisdom, constructed the noble and proportioned fabric of our federal system. "Oh, rise some other such!"

No, fellow citizens, there is something more and other for us to do. And what is that? Among other things, chiefly this: To accept that whole body of measures of compromise, as they are called, by which the government has sought to compose the country in the spirit of 1787; and then that henceforth every man, according to his measure and in his place, in his party, in his social or his literary or his religious circle, in whatever may be his sphere of influence, set himself to suppress the further political agitation of this whole subject.

Of these measures of compromise I may say, in general, that they give the whole victory to neither of the great divisions of the country, and are therefore the fitter to form the basis of a permanent adjustment. I think that under their operation and by the concurrence of other agencies it will assuredly come to pass, that on all that vast accession of territory beyond and above Texas no slave will ever breathe the air, and I rejoice at that. They abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and I rejoice at that. They restore the fugitive to the master, and while I mourn that there is a slave who needs to run, or a master who desires to pursue, I should be unworthy of the privilege of addressing this assembly if I did not declare that I have not a shadow of doubt that Congress has the constitutional power to pass this law just as it is, and had no doubt, before I listened to the clear and powerful argument of Mr. Curtis to-night, that it was out of all question their duty to pass some effectual law on the subject, and that it is incumbent on every man who recognizes a single obligation of citizenship to assist, in his spheres, in its execution.

Accepting, then, these measures of constitutional compromise in the spirit of union, let us set ourselves to suppress or mitigate the political agitation of slavery.

And, in the *first place*, I submit that the two great political parties of the North are called upon by every consideration of patriotism and duty to strike this whole subject from their respective issues. I go for no amalgamation of parties, and for the forming of no new party. But I

admit the deepest solicitude that those which now exist, preserving their actual organization and general principles and aims—if so it must be—should to this extent coalesce. Neither can act in this behalf effectually alone. Honorable concert is indispensable, and they owe it to the country. Have not the eminent men of both these great organizations united on this adjustment? Are they not both primarily national parties? Is it not one of their most important and beautiful uses that they extend the whole length and breadth of our land, and that they help, or ought to help, to hold the extreme North to the extreme South by a tie stronger almost than that of mere patriotism, by that surest cement of friendship—common opinions on the great concerns of the republic?

You are a Democrat, and have you not for thirty-two years in fifty united with the universal Democratic party in the choice of Southern presidents? Has it not been your function for even a larger part of the last half century to rally with the South for the support of the general administration? Has it not ever been your boast, your merit as a party, that you are in an intense and even characteristic degree national and unionist in your spirit and politics, although you had your origin in the assertion of state rights; that you have contributed in a thousand ways to the extension of our territory and the establishment of our martial fame; and that you follow the flag on whatever field or deck it waves? And will you, for the sake of a temporary victory in a state, or for any other cause, insert an article in your creed and give a direction to your tactics which shall detach you from such companionship and unfit you for such service in all time to come?

You are a Whig—I give you my hand on that—and is not your party national too? Do you not find your fastest allies at the South? Do you not need the vote of Louisiana, of North Carolina, of Tennessee, of Kentucky, to defend you from the redundant capital, matured skill, and pauper labor of Europe? Did you not just now, with a wise contempt of sectional issues and sectional noises, unite to call that brave, firm, and good OLD MAN from his plantation, and seat him with all the honors in the place of Washington? Circumstances have forced both of these

parties—the Northern and the Southern divisions of both—to suspend for a space the legitimate objects of their institution. For a space, laying them aside and resolving ourselves into our individual capacities, we have thought and felt on nothing but slavery. Those circumstances exist no longer, and shall we not instantly renew the old ties, and by manly and honorable concert resolve to spare America that last calamity—the formation of parties according to geographical lines?

I maintain, in the *second place*, that the CONSCIENCE of this community has a duty to do, not yet adequately performed; and that is, on grounds of moral obligation, not merely to call up men to the obedience of law, but on the same grounds to discourage and modify the further agitation of this topic of slavery, *in the spirit in which, thus far, that agitation has been conducted.* I mean to say that our moral duties, not at all less than our political interests, demand that we accept this compromise, and that we promote the peace it is designed to restore.

Fellow citizens, was there ever a development of sheer fanaticism more uninstructed or more dangerous than that which teaches that conscience prescribes the continued political or other exasperating agitation of this subject? That it will help, in the least degree, to ameliorate the condition of one slave, or to hasten the day of his emancipation, I do not believe, and no man can be certain that he knows. But the philanthropist, so he qualifies himself, will say that slavery is a relation of wrong, and, whatever becomes of the effort, conscience impels him to keep up the agitation till the wrong somehow is ended. Is he, I answer, quite sure that a conscience enlightened to a comprehension and comparison of all its duties impels him to do any such thing? Is he quite sure that that which an English or French or German philanthropist might in conscience counsel or do, touching this matter of Southern slavery, that that also he, the American philanthropist, may, in conscience, counsel or do? Does it go for nothing in his ethics that he stands, that the whole morality of the North stands, in a totally different relation to the community of the South from that of the foreign propagandist, and that this relation may possibly somewhat—aye, to a vast extent—modify all our

duties? Instead of hastily inferring that, because those states are *sister states*, you are bound to meddle and agitate, and drive pitch-pine knots into their flesh, and set them on fire, may not the fact that they are *sister states* be the very reason why, though others may do so, you may not? In whomsoever else these enterprises of an offensive and aggressive morality are graceful or safe or right, are you quite sure that in you they are either graceful or safe or right?

I have heard that a great statesman living in the North, but living and thinking for the country, has been complained of for saying that we have no more to do with slavery in the South than with slavery in Cuba. Are you quite sure that the sentiment went far enough? Have we quite as much to do? I mean, can we wisely or morally assume to do quite as much with Southern as with Cuban slavery? To all the rest of the world we are united only by the tie of philanthropy or universal benevolence, and our duties to that extent flow from that tie. All that such philanthropy prompts us to print or say or do, touching slavery in Cuba, we may print, say, or do, for what I know or care, subject, I would recommend, to the restraints of common sense, and taking reasonable thought for our personal security. But to America—*to our America*—we are united by another tie, and may not a principled patriotism, on the clearest grounds of moral obligation, limit the sphere and control the aspirations and prescribe the flights of philanthropy itself?

In the *first place*, remember, I entreat you, that on considerations of policy and wisdom—truest policy, profoundest wisdom, for the greater good and the higher glory of America, for the good of the master and slave, now and for all generations—you have entered with the Southern states into the most sacred and awful and tender of all the relations: the relation of country; and therefore, that you have, expressly and by implication, laid yourselves under certain restraints; you have pledged yourselves to a certain measure and a certain spirit of forbearance; you have shut yourselves out from certain fields and highways of philanthropic enterprise, open to you before, open to the rest of the world now, but from which, *in order to bestow larger*

and mightier blessings on man, in another way, you have agreed to retire.

Yes, we have entered with them into the most sacred, salutary, and permanent of the relations of social man. We have united with them in that great master performance of human beings, that one work on which the moralists whom I love concur in supposing that the Supreme Governor looks down with peculiar complacency, the building of a commonwealth. Finding themselves side by side with those states some sixty years ago in this new world—thirteen states of us then in all, thirty-one to-day—touching one another on a thousand points, discerning perfectly that, unless the doom of man was to be reversed for them, there was no alternative but to become dearest friends or bitterest enemies—so much Thucydides and the historians of the beautiful and miserable Italian republics of the middle ages had taught them—drawn together, also felicitously, by a common speech and blood, and the memory of their recent labor of glory, our fathers adopted the conclusion that the best interests of humanity, in all her forms, demanded that we should enter into the grand, sacred, and tender relations of country. All things demanded it: the love of man, the hopes of liberty—all things. Hereby, only, can America bless herself and bless the world.

Consider, in the *next place*, that to secure that largest good, to create and preserve a country, and thus to contribute to the happiness of man as far as that grand and vast instrumentality may be made to contribute to happiness, it became indispensable to take upon themselves, for themselves, and for all the generations who should follow, certain engagements with those to whom we became united. Some of these engagements were express. Such is that for the restoration of persons owing service according to the law of a state, and flying from it. That is express. It is written in this Constitution in terms. It was inserted in it by what passed, sixty years ago, for the morality and religion of Massachusetts and New England. Yes, it was written there by men who knew their Bible, Old Testament and New, as thoroughly, and reverenced it and its Divine Author and His Son, the Savior and Redeemer, as profoundly as we. Others of those engagements, and those

how vast and sacred, were implied. It is not enough to say that the Constitution did not give to the new nation a particle of power to intermeddle by law with slavery within the states, and therefore it has no such power. This is true, but not all the truth. No man pretends we have power to intermeddle by law. But how much more than this is implied in the sacred relation of country. It is a marriage of more than two, for more than a fleeting natural life. "It is to be looked on with other reverence." It is an engagement, as between the real parties to it, an engagement the most solemn, to love, honor, cherish, and keep through all the ages of a nation. It is an engagement the most solemn, to cultivate those affections that shall lighten and perpetuate a tie which ought to last so long. It is an engagement, then, which limits the sphere and controls the enterprises of philanthropy itself. If you discern that by violating the express pledge of the Constitution and refusing to permit the fugitives to be restored; by violating the implied pledges; by denying the Christianity of the holder of slaves; by proclaiming him impure, cruel, undeserving of affection, trust, and regard; that by this passionate and vehement aggression upon the prejudices, institutions, and investments of a whole region—that by all this you are dissolving the ties of country, endangering its disruption, frustrating the policy on which our fathers created it, and bringing into jeopardy the multiform and incalculable good which it was designed to secure, and would secure, then, whatever foreign philanthropy might do, in such a prospect, *your* philanthropy is arrested and rebuked by a "higher law." In this competition of affections, country—*omnes omnium charitates complectens*—the expression, the sum total of all things most dearly loved, surely holds the first place.

Will anybody say that these engagements thus taken, for these ends, are but "covenants with hell," which there is no morality and no dignity in keeping? From such desperate and shameless fanaticism, if such there is, I turn to the moral sentiments of this assembly. It is not here, it is not in this hall—the blood of Warren in the chair, the form of Washington before you—that I will defend the Constitution from the charge of being a compact of guilt. I will not

here defend the convention which framed it, and the conventions and people which adopted it, from the charge of having bought this great blessing of country by immoral promises more honored in the breach than in the observance. Thank God, we yet hold that that transaction was honest, that work beautiful and pure, and those engagements, in all their length and breadth and height and depth, sacred.

Yet I will say that, if to the formation of such a union it was indispensable, as we know it was, to contract these engagements expressed and implied, no covenant made by man ever rested on the basis of a sounder morality. They tell us that although you have the strict right, according to the writers on public law, to whom Mr. Curtis has referred, to restore the fugitive slave to his master, yet that the virtue of compassion commands you not to do so. But in order to enable ourselves to do all that good and avert all that evil—boundless and inappreciable both—which we do and avert by the instrumentality of a union under a common government, may we not, on the clearest moral principles, agree not to exercise compassion in that particular way? The mere virtue of compassion would command you to rescue any prisoner. But the citizen, to the end that he may be enabled, and others be enabled, to indulge a more various and useful compassion in other modes, agrees not to indulge it practically in that mode. Is such a stipulation immoral? No more so is this of the Constitution.

They tell us that slavery is so wicked a thing that they must pursue it, by agitation, to its home in the states; and that if there is an implied engagement to abstain from doing so, it is an engagement to neglect an opportunity of doing good, and void in the forum of conscience. But was it ever heard of that one may not formally bind himself to abstain from what he thinks a particular opportunity of doing good? A contract in general restraint of philanthropy or any other useful calling is void; but a contract to abstain from a specific sphere of exertion is not void, and may be wise and right. To entitle himself to instruct heathen children on week days, might not a pious missionary engage not to attempt to preach to their parents on Sunday? To win the opportunity of achieving the mighty good

summed up in the pregnant language of the preamble to the Constitution, such good as man has not on this earth been many times permitted to do or dream of, we might well surrender the privilege of reviling the masters of slaves, with whom we must "either live or bear no life."

Will the philanthropist tell you that there is nothing conspicuous enough and glorious enough for him in thus refraining from this agitation, just because our relations to the South, under the Constitution, seem to forbid it? Aye, indeed! Is it even so? Is his morality of so ambitious and mounting a type that an effort, by the exercise of love or kindness or tolerance, to knit still closer the hearts of a great people, and thus to insure ages of peace, of progress, of enjoyment, to so vast a mass of the family of man, seems too trivial a feat? Oh, how stupendous a mistake! What achievement of philanthropy bears any proportion to the pure and permanent glory of that achievement whereby clusters of contiguous states, perfectly organized governments in themselves, every one full of energy, conscious of strength, full of valor, fond of war—instead of growing first jealous, then hostile, like the tribes of Greece after the Persian had retired, like the cities of Italy at the dawn of the modern world—are melted into one, so that for centuries of internal peace the grand agencies of amelioration and advancement shall operate unimpeded; the rain and dew of heaven descending on ground better and still better prepared to admit them; the course of time, the providence of God, leading on that noiseless progress whose wheels shall not turn back, whose consummation shall be in the brightness of the latter day. What achievement of man may be compared with this achievement? For the slave alone, what promises half so much? And this is not glorious enough for the ambition of philanthropy!

No, fellow citizens, the first of men are the builders of empires. Here is, my friends, here, right here—in doing something in our day and generation toward "forming a more perfect union"; in doing something by literature, by public speech, by sound industrial policy, by the careful culture of fraternal love and regard, by the intercourse of business and friendship, by all the means within our command, in doing something to leave the Union, when we

die, stronger than we found it—here, here is the field of our grandest duties and highest rewards. Let the grandeur of such duties, let the splendor of such rewards, suffice us. Let them reconcile and constrain us to turn from that equivocal philanthropy which violates contracts, which tramples on law, which confounds the whole subordination of virtues, which counts it a light thing that a nation is rent asunder, and the swords of brothers sheathed in the bosoms of brothers, if thus the chains of one slave may be violently and prematurely broken.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL

THE DESERTION OF GORDON

[Lord Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill, an English statesman, was born in 1849, being the third son of the Duke of Marlborough. He studied at Oxford, and in 1874 was elected to the House of Commons in the Conservative interest. In course of time he severed his connection with his party associates, and with a small following of his own formed an independent group in the House of Commons. This "fourth party" lost no opportunity of attacking the Liberal government then in power, thereby causing Gladstone and the members of the Cabinet great embarrassment. Churchill advocated universal suffrage and founded the "Primrose League." His prominence at last forced the Conservative party to give him recognition, and he was made secretary of state for India in 1885, when the Salisbury Cabinet was formed. When the Home Rule bill was brought in by Gladstone, he called it a "desperate and insane" measure, and upon the defeat of the Liberals he was made chancellor of the exchequer and leader of his party in the House of Commons. To the great surprise of the country, Lord Randolph Churchill resigned as chancellor of the exchequer before he had introduced a budget, his reason being, apparently, that he could not get along with some other members of the administration. He died in 1895. The following speech was delivered in London in 1884, and related to the Egyptian campaign of Colonel Charles ("Chinese") Gordon, who fell in the Khartoum massacre in 1885.]

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN: I rise for the purpose of moving the first resolution, and, in order that we may consider that resolution with advantage, I would beg all those gentlemen here who do not altogether concur with the views which we are going to expound, to listen to the discussion with equanimity, and, if possible, to reply to the arguments we may urge. [A voice: "They're for an amendment."] It would conduce more to the dignity of a London meeting, it will conduce more to the maintenance of the high character of the citizens of this great metropolis,

if any gentlemen who have counter opinions to urge to those of the majority of the meeting, will come to the platform and address us. We have, gentlemen, to-day to set an example to the country: let us first set an example of order. The resolution which I have to propose is in these terms: "That in the opinion of this meeting, her majesty's government are solely responsible for the anarchy which prevails in Egypt, and the bloodshed which has occurred, and which is imminent, in the Sudan, and that the vacillating and pusillanimous policy of the ministers deserves the severest censure of the country."

We are gathered together this afternoon for a serious purpose: no other, indeed, than to pronounce, after due deliberation, the strongest and most resolute condemnation of Mr. Gladstone's Egyptian policy, and our detestation and abhorrence of the bloodshed and misery of which he has been the immediate and direct cause. I say Mr. Gladstone's Egyptian policy, because I utterly decline to recognize as responsible agents either his ministerial colleagues or his parliamentary supporters. Those parties have so wallowed in a stifling morass of the most degraded and servile worship of the prime minister that they have sunk below the level of slaves; they have become mere puppets, the objects of derision and contempt; they have lost all claim to the title of Englishmen, and I think they have lost all claim to the title of rational human beings. To give you an instance of the abject imbecility which has struck down the Liberal party, I would mention what occurred in the House of Commons on Thursday night. Mr. Forster in that great speech which he made that evening—a speech in which he promised one vote to the government in the House of Commons, and alienated a hundred thousand votes from the government in the country—Mr. Forster, I say, expressed the opinion that the government ought to have rescued the garrison of Sinkat. "How?" cried out some importunate Liberals. "How?" was the plaintive cry they raised. "How?" shouted Mr. Forster, turning upon them, so that they wished themselves a hundred leagues under the sea, "How? Why, by doing a fortnight earlier what they are doing now—sending British soldiers to the garrison's rescue." There is a good instance of the hopeless

and incurable mental alienation to which the once free and independent Liberal party have been reduced by Mr. Gladstone. It was indeed a melancholy spectacle.

I said that our purpose this afternoon was a serious one, and it is so. It is a serious thing for Englishmen to meet together in open day for the purpose of doing all they can to destroy a government. But we are not alone. Thousands of your countrymen have already met, and thousands more will meet, animated by the same feelings as yourselves, and, like yourselves, resolved to exhaust their energies in a supreme effort to avert further disgrace from our names, future defeat from our army, and ultimate ruin from our country, by dashing from his pride of place the evil and moonstruck minister who has brought England into grievous peril. Perilous, I say, is our condition, for it is perilous for a country to shed human blood in vain; it is perilous for a country to assume responsibilities which it is too cowardly to discharge; it is perilous for a country to permit its foreign interests to be in such a condition that any morning we may wake to hear Europe demanding reparation and even vengeance. Once again, for the fourth time in four years, do the ministry, whose program was peace, and whose component parts were Quakers, call upon you to give them authority to wage a bloody war. Of their former wars the results have been either infamous or futile —infamy in the south of Africa; futility in the north of Africa. Will you, I ask, with these memories still fresh in your minds, permit these false guides again to direct your course? There can be but one answer. If war is again to be urged, if British blood and British treasure are again to be poured forth, if the regeneration of Egypt and the East is once more to be taken in hand, then other heads must do the work, and other policies must be pursued. A parliament which has long ceased to represent England must be dissolved, and a ministry for a parallel to which you must go back to the days of Shaftesbury or Lord North must be placed on its trial by the people. We have to provide for the safety of the hero Gordon; for the safety of the four thousand British soldiers sent to Suakim; for the safety of the garrisons of the Sudan—thirty thousand souls in all—whose one and only hope is now reposed in you.

Above all, we have to provide for the safety of our position in the Delta of the Nile. Shall labors such as these, interests so tremendous and so vital, be committed to the hands of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues, men who have on their souls the blood of the massacre of Maiwand, the blood of the massacre of Lang's Nek, the blood of George Colley, the blood of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, and many other true and loyal subjects of the crown in Ireland, the blood of Hicks Pasha and his ten thousand soldiers, the blood of the army of General Baker, the blood of Tewfik Bey and his five hundred heroes? For four years this ministry has literally waded in blood; their hands are literally dripping and reeking with blood. From massacre to massacre they march, and their course is ineffaceably stamped upon the history of the world by an overflowing stream of blood. How many more of England's heroes—how many more of England's best and bravest, are to be sacrificed to the Moloch of Midlothian? This, too, is shocking and horrible—the heartless indifference and callousness of the Liberal party to narratives of slaughter and unutterable woe. Fifteen times did Mr. Gladstone on Tuesday night, in his reply to the grave and measured accusations of Sir Stafford Northcote—fifteen times, I say, did he excite the laughter of his Liberal supporters with a frivolity which was too hideous to contemplate. Talk of Bulgarian atrocities! Add them together, and even multiply them if you will, and you will not exceed the total of the atrocities and the infamies which have distinguished with an awful reputation the most bloodstained and withal the most cowardly government which England has ever seen.

Well, we are met together this afternoon as loyal subjects of the queen and as lovers of our country for this purpose, and this purpose only—to put a stop to further wicked and wanton bloodshed. We know that great empires must sometimes fight great battles, and that empires which fear to fight battles will soon cease to be empires; but we are resolved that the battles which we have to fight shall be fought for definite objects and for noble ends, and that poltroons and traitors, in the garb of ministers of the crown, shall sacrifice no longer for worthless and degraded aims the life-blood of our country. The supporters of the present

government exclaim that the Tory party, although prodigal of censure, is deficient in a policy of its own; and with many taunts they call upon us to disclose the direction in which our efforts would be turned in the event of a change in the councils of the crown. The demand cannot be considered unfair, and the reply is not so difficult as some people seem to think. We recognize to the very uttermost the immense responsibilities which this country has incurred toward Egypt and toward the interests of Europe there, and to the discharge of these responsibilities we would be prepared to apply all the resources, if need be, of the empire of the queen; and till those responsibilities are satisfied we would neither stop nor stay. The history of the Tory party in the past is, I fearlessly assent, an ample guaranty that the recognition of a responsibility and the full discharge of a responsibility are inseparable and consequential. I cannot claim to have the smallest share in the councils of the leaders of the Tory party, whoever they may be—and therefore, as far as they are concerned, I speak without authority. But having studied with some care the history of our party in the past, possessing an unbounded faith in its future, and being not altogether ignorant of the state of public opinion, I will venture to say this much—that the policy of the Tory party, should it be placed in power, will be the policy of calling things by their right names. The occupation of Egypt by the British forces will be called a protectorate of Egypt by the British empire, having for its object the establishment, in process of time, of a government at Cairo which shall be consonant with the legitimate and laudable aspirations of the Egyptian people, which shall be able to protect itself alike from internal tumult and from foreign intrigue, which, while it shall develop the undoubted resources of Egypt, shall faithfully discharge the equitable liabilities of its people, and which, as far as human governments can do, shall give promise of prosperity and happiness in the land of the Nile. We are now in Egypt by the sufferance of Europe, but we must endeavor to be in Egypt by the mandate of Europe. Our protectorate, to be effective and authoritative and secure, should be acquiesced in by a European congress, in which Turkey shall be adequately represented and the rights and powers of

the Sultan loyally secured. Our protectorate, if it is to be crowned with success, must not shrink from dealing comprehensively and boldly with the financial indebtedness of Egypt, even though such dealing should involve some pecuniary liability on ourselves. The work, if you undertake it, will be a work of time—perhaps a long time. It will be a work of difficulty, and perhaps a work of danger; but it would also be a work of duty and a work of honor; and from work of that kind Britain has never yet recoiled. It is a work which, if courageously persisted in, will bind more closely to us than heretofore the sympathies of the Mohammedan races, and will establish on deeper foundations our dominions in the East. Our aims are honor, peace, and freedom, and we should not shrink from prosecuting those aims, if need be, by force of arms. Conscious of their magnanimity, we would go boldly forward, knowing well that the results of our policy would surely be to undo the heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free.

MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO

THE FOURTH PHILIPPIC

[Marcus Tullius Cicero, a Roman statesman and writer, and one of the greatest orators of any age, was born in Arpinum in 106 B.C. His education was entrusted to an orator of distinction, and the young Cicero spared no pains in mastering every intricacy of the art in which he was destined to achieve such renown. He entered public life early, and was chosen successively questor, edile, pretor, and consul. In this last office he saved the state by foiling the conspirator Catiline. The series of speeches in which he denounced the adventurer to the senate rank among the finest extant specimens of ancient oratory. His political opponents subsequently attained power, and banished him from Rome upon a charge of usurpation of authority in his suppression of Catiline's fellow plotters. He was later recalled, only to be again proscribed during the civil war, and slain (43 B.C.) by a party of Antony's troops sent in pursuit of him. The circumstances under which the three orations on the agrarian law were delivered are as follows: A short time before Cicero's inauguration as consul, which took place on the first of January, Publius Servilius Rullus, one of the new tribunes (who entered on their office on the tenth of December), had been alarming the senate with the proposal of a new agrarian law, the purport of which was to appoint ten commissioners (decemviri), with absolute power, for five years, over all the revenues of the republic; to distribute them at pleasure to the citizens; to sell and buy what lands they thought fit; to determine the rights of the present possessors; to require an account from all the generals abroad, except Pompey, of the spoils taken in their wars; to settle colonies wherever they judged it proper, and especially at Capua; and, in short, to have the entire command of the money and forces of the empire. This almost revolutionary movement of the people's representative was successfully opposed by the orator. The fourth among his famous Philippics was delivered at Rome, 44 B.C.; the oration on the Agrarian Law was made at Rome, B.C. 64.]

THE great numbers in which you are here met this day, O Romans, and this assembly, greater than, it seems to me, I ever remember, inspires me with both an exceeding eagerness to defend the republic and with a great hope of reestablishing it. Although my courage indeed has never failed, what has been unfavorable is the time; and the moment that has appeared to show any dawn of light, I at once have been the leader in the defense of your liberty. And if I had attempted to have done so before, I should not be able to do so now. For this day, O Romans (that you may not think it is but a trifling business in which we have been engaged), the foundations have been laid for future actions. For the senate has no longer been content with styling Antonius an enemy in words, but it has shown by actions that it thinks him one. And now I am much more elated still, because you too, with such great unanimity and with such a clamor, have sanctioned our declaration that he is an enemy.

And indeed, O Romans, it is impossible but that either the men must be impious who have levied arms against the consul, or else that he must be an enemy against whom they have rightly taken arms. And this doubt the senate has this day removed—not, indeed, that there really was any; but it has prevented the possibility of there being any. Caius Cæsar, who has upheld and who is still upholding the republic and your freedom by his zeal and wisdom, and at the expense of his patrimonial estate, has been complimented with the highest praise of the senate.

I praise you—yes, I praise you greatly, O Romans, when you follow with the most grateful minds the name of that most illustrious youth, or rather boy; for his actions belong to immortality, the name of youth only to his age. I can recollect many things; I have heard of many things; I have read of many things; but in the whole history of the whole world I have never known anything like this. For, when we were weighed down with slavery, when the evil was daily increasing, when we had no defense, while we were in dread of the pernicious and fatal return of Marcus Antonius from Brundusium, this young man adopted the design which none of us had ventured to hope for, which beyond all question none of us were acquainted with, of

raising an invincible army of his father's soldiers, and so hindering the frenzy of Antonius, spurred on as it was by the most inhuman counsels, from the power of doing mischief to the republic.

For who is there who does not see clearly that, if Cæsar had not prepared an army, the return of Antonius must have been accompanied by our destruction? For, in truth, he returned in such a state of mind, burning with hatred of you all, stained with the blood of the Roman citizens whom he had murdered at Suessa and at Brundusium, that he thought of nothing but the utter destruction of the republic. And what protection could have been found for your safety and for your liberty if the army of Caius Cæsar had not been composed of the bravest of his father's soldiers? And with respect to his praises and honors—and he is entitled to divine and everlasting honors for his godlike and undying services—the senate has just consented to my proposals, and has decreed that a motion be submitted to it at the very earliest opportunity.

Now, who is there who does not see that by this decree Antonius has been adjudged to be an enemy? For what else can we call him, when the senate decides that extraordinary honors are to be devised for those men who are leading armies against him? What! did not the Martial legion (which appears to me by some divine permission to have derived its name from that god from whom we have heard that the Roman people descended) decide by its resolutions that Antonius was an enemy before the senate had come to any resolution? For if he be not an enemy, we must inevitably decide that those men who have deserted the consul are enemies. Admirably and seasonably, O Romans, have you by your cries sanctioned the noble conduct of the men of the Martial legion, who have come over to the authority of the senate, to your liberty, and to the whole republic, and have abandoned that enemy and robber and parricide of his country. Nor did they display only their spirit and courage in doing this, but their caution and wisdom also. They encamped at Alba, in a city convenient, fortified, near, full of brave men and loyal and virtuous citizens. The fourth legion, imitating the virtue of this Martial legion, under the leadership of Lucius Egnatuleius,

whom the senate deservedly praised a little while ago, has also joined the army of Caius Cæsar.

What more adverse decisions, O Marcus Antonius, can you want? Cæsar, who has levied an army against you, is extolled to the skies. The legions are praised in the most complimentary language, which have abandoned you, which were sent for into Italy by you, and which, if you had chosen to be a consul rather than an enemy, were wholly devoted to you. And the fearless and honest decision of those legions is confirmed by the senate, is approved of by the whole Roman people—unless, indeed, you to-day, O Romans, decide that Antonius is a consul and not an enemy. I thought, O Romans, that you did think as you show you do. What! Do you suppose that the municipal towns and the colonies and the prefectures have any other opinion? All men are agreed with one mind; so that every one who wishes the state to be saved must take up every sort of arms against that pestilence. What, I should like to know, does the opinion of Decimus Brutus, O Romans, which you can gather from his edict which has this day reached us, appear to any one deserving of being lightly esteemed? Rightly and truly do you say No, O Romans. For the family and name of Brutus has been by some especial kindness and liberality of the immortal gods given to the republic for the purpose of at one time establishing, and at another of recovering, the liberty of the Roman people. What, then, has been the opinion which Decimus Brutus has formed of Marcus Antonius? He excludes him from his province. He opposes him with his army. He rouses all Gaul to war, which is already roused of its own accord, and in consequence of the judgment which it has itself formed. If Antonius be consul, Brutus is an enemy. Can we then doubt which of thse alternatives is the fact?

And just as you now, with one mind and one voice, affirm that you entertain no doubt, so did the senate just now decree that Decimus Brutus deserved excellently well of the republic, inasmuch as he was defending the authority of the senate and the liberty and empire of the Roman people. Defending it against whom? Why, against an enemy. For what other sort of defense deserves praise? In the next place, the province of Gaul is praised, and is

deservedly complimented in most honorable language by the senate for resisting Antonius. But if that province considered him the consul, and still refused to receive him, it would be guilty of great wickedness. For all the provinces belong to the consul of right, and are bound to obey him. Decimus Brutus, imperator and consul-elect, a citizen born for the republic, denies that he is consul; Gaul denies it; all Italy denies it; the senate denies it; you deny it. Who, then, thinks that he is consul except a few robbers? Although even they themselves do not believe what they say; nor is it possible that they should differ from the judgment of all men, impious and desperate men though they be. But the hope of plunder and booty blinds their minds: men whom no gifts of money, no allotment of land, nor even that interminable auction has satisfied; who have proposed to themselves the city, the properties, and fortunes of all the citizens as their booty; and who, as long as there is something for them to seize and carry off, think that nothing will be wanting to them; among whom Marcus Antonius (O ye immortal gods! avert, I pray you, and efface this omen) has promised to divide this city. May things rather happen, O Romans, as you pray that they should, and may the chastisement of this frenzy fall on him and on his friend! And, indeed, I feel sure that it will be so. For I think that at present not only men, but the immortal gods, have all united together to preserve this republic. For if the immortal gods foreshow us the future, by means of portents and prodigies, then it has been openly revealed to us that punishment is near at hand to him, and liberty to us. Or if it was impossible for such unanimity on the part of all men to exist without the inspiration of the gods, in either case how can we doubt as to the inclinations of the heavenly deities?

It only remains, O Romans, for you to persevere in the sentiments which you at present display.

I will act, therefore, as commanders are in the habit of doing when their army is ready for battle, who, although they see their soldiers ready to engage, still address an exhortation to them; and in like manner I will exhort you who are already eager and burning to recover your liberty. You have not—you have not indeed, O Romans, to war

against an enemy with whom it is possible to make peace on any terms whatever. For he does not now desire your slavery, as he did before, but he is angry now and thirsts for your blood. No sport appears more delightful to him than bloodshed and slaughter, and the massacre of citizens before his eyes. You have not, O Romans, to deal with a wicked and profligate man, but with an unnatural and savage beast. And, since he has fallen into a well, let him be buried in it. For if he escapes out of it, there will be no inhumanity of torture which it will be possible to avoid. But he is at present hemmed in, pressed, and besieged by those troops which we already have, and will soon be still more so by those which in a few days the new consuls will levy. Apply yourselves then to this business, as you are doing. Never have you shown greater unanimity in any cause; never have you been so cordially united with the senate. And no wonder! For the question now is not in what condition we are to live, but whether we are to live at all, or to perish with torture and ignominy.

Although nature, indeed, has appointed death for all men, yet valor is accustomed to ward off any cruelty or disgrace in death. And that is an inalienable possession of the Roman race and name. Preserve, I beseech you, O Romans, this attribute which your ancestors have left you as a sort of inheritance. Although all other things are uncertain, fleeting, transitory, virtue alone is planted firm with very deep roots. It cannot be undermined by any violence; it can never be moved from its position. By it your ancestors first subdued the whole of Italy; then destroyed Carthage, overthrew Numantia, and reduced the most mighty kings and most warlike nations under the dominion of this empire.

And your ancestors, O Romans, had to deal with an enemy who had also a republic, a senate house, a treasury, harmonious and united citizens, and with whom, if fortune had so willed it, there might have been peace and treaties on settled principles. But this enemy of yours is attacking your republic, but has none himself; is eager to destroy the senate, that is to say, the council of the whole world, but has no public council himself; he has exhausted your treasury, and has none of his own. For how can a man be

supported by the unanimity of his citizens, who has no city at all? And what principles of peace can there be with that man who is full of incredible cruelty and destitute of faith?

The whole, then, of the contest, O Romans, which is now before the Roman people, the conqueror of all nations, is with an assassin, a robber, a Spartacus. For as to his habitual boast of being like Catiline, he is equal to him in wickedness, but inferior in energy. He, though he had no army, rapidly levied one. This man has lost that very army which he had. As, therefore, by my diligence and the authority of the senate, and your own zeal and valor, you crushed Catiline, so you will very soon hear that this infamous piratical enterprise of Antonius has been put down by your own perfect and unexampled harmony with the senate, and by the good fortune and valor of your armies and generals. I, for my part, as far as I am able to labor and to effect anything by my care and exertions and vigilance and authority and counsel, will omit nothing which I may think serviceable to your liberty. Nor could I omit it without wickedness after all your most ample and honorable kindness to me. However, on this day, encouraged by the motion of a most gallant man, and one most firmly attached to you, Marcus Servilius, whom you see before you, and his colleagues also, most distinguished men and most virtuous citizens; and partly, too, by my advice and my example, we have, for the first time after a long interval, fired up again with a hope of liberty.

ON THE AGRARIAN LAW

THE decemviri will sell the booty, the spoils, the division of the plunder, the very camp of Cneus Pompeius, while the general is forced to sit still. The whole of the Propontis and of the Hellespont will therefore come under the power of the pretor; the whole coast of the Lycians and Cilicians will be advertised for sale; Mysia and Phrygia will be subjected to the same conditions.

That which was then openly sought, is now endeavored

to be effected secretly by mines. For the decemvirs will say, what indeed is said by many, and has often been said, that after the consulship of those men all that kingdom became the property of the Roman people by the request of King Alexander. Will you then give Alexandria to those men when they ask for it in an underhand way, whom you resisted when they openly fought against you Which, in the name of the immortal gods, do these things seem to you—the designs of sober men or the dreams of drunken ones; the serious thoughts of wise men or the frantic wishes of madmen? See, now, in the second chapter of this law, how that profligate debauchee is disturbing the republic, how he is ruining and dissipating the possessions left us by our ancestors, so as to be not less a spendthrift in the patrimony of the Roman people than in his own. He is advertising for sale by his law all the revenues, for the decemvirs to sell them; that is to say, he is advertising an auction of the property of the state. He wants lands to be bought, in order to be distributed; he is seeking money. No doubt he will devise something and bring it forward; for in the preceding chapters the dignity of the Roman people was attacked; the name of our dominion was held up as an object of common hatred to all the nations of the earth; cities which were at peace with us, lands belonging to the allies, the ranks of kings in alliance with us, were all made a present of to the decemvirs; and now they want actual ready money paid down to them. I am waiting to see what this vigilant and clever tribune is contriving. Let the Scantian wood, says he, be sold. Did you then find this wood mentioned among the possessions that were left, or in the pasture lands of the lessors? If there is anything which you have hunted out, and discovered, and brought to light out of darkness, although it is not just, still use that, since it is convenient, and since you yourself were the person to bring it forward. But shall you sell the Scantian wood while we are consuls and while this senate is in existence? Shall you touch any of the revenues? Shall you take away from the Roman people that which is their strength in time of war, their ornament in time of peace? But then, indeed, I shall think myself a lazier consul than those fearless men who filled this office in the times of our

ancestors; because the revenues which were acquired by the Roman people when they were consuls will be considered not able to be preserved when I am consul.

He is selling all the possessions in Italy in regular order. Forsooth, he is very busy in that occupation. For he does not omit one. He goes through the whole of Sicily in the account books of the censors. He does not omit one single house or one single field. You have heard an auction of the property of the Roman people given notice of by a tribune of the people, and fixed for the month of January; and I suppose you do not doubt that they who procured these things by their arms and their valor did not sell them for the sake of the treasury, on purpose that we might have something to sell for the sake of bribery.

See, now, how much more undisguisedly than before he proceeds on his course. For it has been already shown by me how they attacked Pompeius in the earlier part of the law; and now they shall show it also themselves. He orders the lands belonging to the men of Attalia and Olympus to be sold. These lands the victory of Publius Servilius, that most gallant general, had made the property of the Roman people. After that, the royal domains in Macedonia, which were acquired partly by the valor of Titus Flaminius, and partly by that of Lucius Paulus, who conquered Perses. After that, that most excellent and productive land which belongs to Corinth, which was added to the revenues of the Roman people by the campaigns and successes of Lucius Mummius. After that, they sell the lands in Spain near Carthagena, acquired by the distinguished valor of the two Scipios. Then Carthagena itself, which Publius Scipio, having stripped it of all its fortifications, consecrated to the eternal recollection of men—whether his purpose was to keep up the memory of the disaster of the Carthaginians, or to bear witness to our victory, or to fulfil some religious obligation. Having sold all these ensigns and crowns, as it were, of the empire, with which the republic was adorned, and handed down to you by your ancestors, they then order the lands to be sold which King Mithridates possessed in Paphlagonia and Pontus and Cappadocia. Do they not seem to be pursuing without much disguise, and almost with the crier's spear, the army of Cneus Pompeius, when

they order those lands to be sold in which he is now engaged and carrying on war?

But what is the meaning of this, that they fix no place for this auction which they are establishing? For power is given to the decemvirs by this law, of holding their sales in any places which seem convenient to them. The censors are not allowed to let the contracts for farming the revenues, except in the sight of the Roman people. Shall these men be allowed to sell them in the most distant countries? But even the most profligate men, when they have squandered their patrimony, prefer selling their property in the auctioneer's rooms, rather than in the roads or in the streets. This man, by his law, gives leave to the decemvirs to sell the property of the Roman people in whatever darkness and whatever solitude they find it convenient. Do you not, moreover, see how grievous, how formidable, and how pregnant with extortion that invasion of the decemvirs and of the multitude that will follow in their train will be to all the provinces and kingdoms and free nations? In the case of those men on whom you have conferred lieutenancies for the sake of entering on inheritances, though they went as private men, on private business, invested with no excessive power and no supreme authority, you have still heard how burdensome their arrival has proved to your allies. What alarm and what misfortune, then, must you think all nations are threatened with by this law, when decemvirs are sent all over the world with supreme power —men of the greatest avarice and with an insatiable desire for every sort of property, whose arrival will be grievous, whose forces will be formidable, whose judicial and arbitrary power will be absolutely intolerable! For they will have the power of deciding whatever they please to be public property, and of selling whatever they decide to be such. Even that very thing which conscientious men will not do —namely, taking money to abstain from selling—is to be made lawful for them to do by the express provisions of the law. From this provision what plunderings, what bargainings, what a regular auction of all law and of every one's fortunes must inevitably arise! Even that which in the former part of the law made in the consulship of Sylla and Pompeius was strictly defined, that they have now left

at the discretion of these men, without any restriction or limitation.

He orders these same decemvirs to impose an exceedingly heavy tax on all the public domains, in order that they might be able both to release what lands they choose and to confiscate what they choose. And in this proceeding it is hard to see whether their severity will be more cruel or their kindness more gainful.

However, there are in the whole law two exceptions, not so much unjust as suspicious. In imposing the tax it makes an exception with respect to the Recentoric district in Sicily; and in selling the land he excepts those with respect to which there was an express provision in the treaty. These lands are in Africa, in the occupation of Hiempsal. Here I ask if sufficient protection is afforded to Hiempsal by the treaty; and if the Recentoric district is private property, what was the use of excepting these lands by name in the law? If that treaty itself has some obscurity in it, and if the Recentoric is sometimes said to be public property, who do you suppose will believe that there have been two interests found in the world, and only two, which he spared for nothing? Does there appear to have been any coin in the world so carefully hidden that the architects of this law have failed to scent it out? They are draining the provinces, the free cities, our allies, our friends, and even the kings who are confederate with us. They are laying hands on the revenues of the Roman people.

That is not enough. Listen—listen, you who, by the most honorable vote of the people and senate, have commanded armies and carried on wars: "Whatever has come or shall come to any one, of booty, of spoils, of money given for gold crowns, which has neither been spent on a monument nor paid into the treasury, is all to be paid over to the decemvirs." From this chapter they expect a great deal. They propose by their resolution an investigation into the affairs of all our generals and all their heirs. But they expect to get the greatest quantity of money from Faustus. That cause which the judges on their oath would not undertake, these decemvirs have undertaken. They think, perhaps, that it was declined by the judges, on purpose to be reserved for them. After that the law most

carefully provides for the future, that, whatever money any general receives, he is at once to pay over to the decemvirs. But here he excepts Pompeius, very much as, as it seems to me, in that law by which aliens are sent away from Rome, an exception is made in favor of Glaucippus. For the effect of this exception is not to confer a kindness on one man, but merely to save one man from injustice. But the man whose spoils the law thus spares has his revenues invaded by the same law. For it orders all the money which is received after our consulship from the new revenues to be placed to the use of the decemvirs. As if we did not see that they were thinking of selling the revenues which Cneus Pompeius has added to the wealth of the Roman people!

You see now, O conscript fathers, that the money which is to belong to the decemvirs is collected and heaped together from every possible source and by every imaginable expedient. The unpopularity arising from their possession of this large sum is to be diminished, for it shall be spent in the purchase of lands. Exceedingly well! Who, then, is to buy these lands? These same decemvirs. You, O Rullus—for I say nothing of the rest of them—are to buy whatever you like; to sell whatever you like; to buy or sell at whatever price you please. For that admirable man takes care not to buy of any one against his will. As if we did not understand that to buy of a man against his will is an injurious thing to do; but to buy of one who has no objection is profitable. How much land (to say nothing of other people) will your father-in-law sell you? and, if I have formed a proper estimate of the fairness of his disposition, will have no objection to sell you? The rest will do the same willingly; they will be glad to exchange the unpopularity attaching to the possession of land for money; to receive whatever they demand, and to part with what they can scarcely retain. Now just see the boundless and intolerable licentiousness of all these measures. Money has been collected for the purchase of lands. Moreover, the lands are not to be bought of people against their will. Suppose all the owners agree not to sell, what is to happen then? Is the money to be refunded? That cannot be. Is it to be collected? The law forbids that. However, let that pass. There is nothing which cannot be bought, if

you will only give as much as the seller asks. Let us plunder the whole world, let us sell our revenues, let us exhaust the treasury, in order that, whether men be owners of wealth, or of odium, or even of a pestilence, still their lands may be bought.

What is to happen then? What sort of men are to be established as settlers in those lands? What is to be the system and plan adopted in the whole business? Colonies, says the law, shall be led thither and settled there. How many? Of what class of men? Where are they to be established? For who is there who does not see that all these things have got to be considered when we are talking of colonies? Did you think, O Rullus, that we would give up the whole of Italy to you and to those contrivers of everything whom you have set up, in an unarmed and defenseless state, for you to strengthen it with garrisons afterward, for you to occupy it with colonies, to hold it bound and fettered by every sort of chain? For where is there any clause to prevent your establishing a colony on the Janiculan Hill, or from oppressing and overwhelming this city with some other city? We will not do so, says he. In the first place, I don't know that; in the next place, I am afraid of you; lastly, I will never permit our safety to depend on your kindness rather than on our own prudence.

But as you wanted to fill all Italy with your colonies, did you think that not one of us would understand what sort of a measure that was? For it is written, "The decemvirs may lead whatever settlers they choose into whatever municipalities and colonies they like; and they may assign them lands in whatever places they please"; so that, when they have occupied all Italy with their soldiers, you may have no hope left you, I will not say of retaining your dignity, but none even of recovering your liberty. And these things, indeed, I object to on suspicion and from conjecture. But now all mistake on any side shall be removed; now they shall show openly that the very name of this republic, and the situation of this city and empire, that even this very temple of the good and great Jupiter, and this citadel of all nations, is odious to them. They wish settlers to be conducted to Capua. They wish again to oppose that city to this city. They think of removing all

their riches thither, of transferring thither the name of the empire. That place which, because of the fertility of its lands and its abundance of every sort of production, is said to be the parent of pride and cruelty—in that our colonists, men selected as fit for every imaginable purpose, will be settled by the decemvirs. No doubt, in that city, in which men, though born to the enjoyment of ancient dignities and hereditary fortunes, were still unable to bear with moderation the luxuriance of their fortunes, your satellites will be able to restrain their insolence and to behave with modesty. Our ancestors removed from Capua the magistrates, the senate, the general council, and all the ensigns of the republic, and left nothing there except the bare name of Capua; not out of cruelty (for what was ever more merciful than they were?—for they often restored their property even to foreign enemies when they had been subdued), but out of wisdom; because they saw that if any trace of the republic remained within those walls, the city itself might be able to afford a home to supreme power. And would not you too see how mischievous these things were, if you were not desirous of overturning the republic, and of procuring a new sort of power for your own selves?

For what is there that is especially to be guarded against in the establishment of colonies? If it be luxury, Capua corrupted Hannibal himself. If it be pride, that appears from the general arrogance of the Campanians to be innate there. If we want a bulwark for the state, then I say that Capua is not placed in front of this city as an outwork, but is opposed to it as an enemy. But how is it armed? O ye immortal gods! For in the Punic war all the power that Capua had, it had from its unassisted resources; but now all the cities which are around Capua will be occupied by colonists, by the order of these same decemvirs. For, for this reason, the law itself allows "that the decemvirs may lead whoever they please as settlers to every town which they choose." And it orders the Campanian district and that of Stella to be divided among these colonists.

I do not complain of the diminution of the revenues, nor of the wickedness of this loss and injury. I pass over those things which there is no one who cannot complain of with the greatest weight and the greatest truth: that we have

not been able to preserve the most important part of the public patrimony of the state, that which has been to us the source of our supply of corn, our granary in time of war, our revenue placed under custody of the seals and bolts of the republic; that we, in short, have abandoned that district to Publius Rullus, which itself by its own resources had resisted both the absolute power of Sylla, and the corrupting liberality of the Gracchi. I do not say that, now that so much has been lost, this is the only revenue which remains in the republic; the only one which, while other sources of income are interrupted, does not fail us; the only one which is splendid in peace, is not worn out in war; which supports our soldiery, and is not afraid of our enemies. I pass over all this which I might say; I reserve that for the assembly of the people. I am speaking now of the danger to our safety and to our liberty. For what do you think will remain to you unimpaired in the whole republic, or in your liberty, or in your dignity, when Rullus, and those whom you are much more afraid of than you are of Rullus, with his whole band of needy and unprincipled men, with all his forces, with all his silver and gold, shall have occupied Capua and the cities around Capua? These things, O conscript fathers, I will resist eagerly and vigorously; and I will not permit men, while I am consul, to bring forth those plans against the republic which they have long been meditating.

You made a great mistake, O Rullus, you and some of your colleagues, when you hoped that, in being in opposition to a consul who studied the interests of the people in reality, not by making a vain parade of so doing, you would be able to gain popularity while overturning the republic. I challenge you; I invite you to the assembly; I will accept the Roman people as an umpire between us.

In fact, if we look round to survey everything which is pleasant and acceptable to the people, we shall find that nothing is so popular as peace and concord and ease. You have given up to me a city made anxious with suspicion, in suspense from fear, harassed to death by your proposed laws and assemblies and seditions. You have inflamed the hopes of the wicked; you have filled the virtuous with alarms; you have banished good faith from the forum and

dignity from the republic. Amid all this commotion and agitation of minds and circumstances, when the voice and authority of the consul has suddenly, from amid such great darkness, dawned on the Roman people; when it has shown that nothing need be feared; that no regular army, no band of extempore ruffians, no colony, no sale of the revenues, no new sort of command, no reign of decemvirs, no new Rome or opposition seat of empire, will be allowed to exist while we are consuls; that the greatest tranquillity of peace and ease will be secured; then, no doubt, we shall have much reason to fear that this beautiful agrarian law of yours will appear popular. But when I have displayed the wickedness of your counsels, the dishonesty of your law, and the treachery which is planned by those popular tribunes of the people against the Roman people; then, I suppose, I shall have reason to fear that I shall not be allowed to appear in the assembly, for the purpose of opposing you; especially when I have determined and resolved so to conduct myself in my consulship (and the duties of the consulship cannot be discharged with dignity and freedom in any other manner) as neither to desire any province nor honor nor dignity nor advantage, nor anything whatever which can have any hindrance thrown in its way by any tribune of the people. The consul states, in full senate, on the calends of January, that if the present condition of the republic continues, and if no new event arises, on account of which he cannot with honor avoid it, he will not go to any province. By that means I shall be able, O conscript fathers, so to behave myself in this magistracy as to be able to restrain any tribune of the people who is hostile to the republic, to despise any one who is hostile to myself.

Wherefore, in the name of the immortal gods, I entreat you, recollect yourselves, O tribunes of the people; desert these men by whom, in a short time, unless you take great care, you will yourselves be deserted. Conspire with us; agree with all virtuous men; defend our common republic with one common zeal and affection. There are many secret wounds sustained by the republic. There are many mischievous counsels of abandoned citizens designed against her. There is no external danger. There is no king, no nation, no people in the world whom we need fear. The

evil is confined within our own walls—internal and domestic. Every one of us to the best of his power ought to resist and to remedy this. You mistake if you think that the senate approves of what is said by me, but that the inclinations of the people are different. All men who wish to be safe themselves will follow the authority of the consul, a man uninfluenced by evil passions, free from all suspicion of guilt; cautious in dangers, not fearful in contests. But if any one of you cherishes a hope that he may be able in a truculent state of affairs to promote his own interests, first of all, let him give up hoping any such thing as long as I am consul. In the next place, let him take me myself as a proof (me whom he sees now consul, though born only in the equestrian rank) of what course of life most easily conducts virtuous men to honor and dignity. But if you, O conscript fathers, assist me with your zeal and energy in defending our common dignity, then, in truth, I shall accomplish that of which our republic is at present in the greatest possible need. I shall make the authority of this order, which existed so long among our ancestors, appear after a long interval to be again restored to the republic.

CHAMP CLARK

ON THE ANNEXATION OF HAWAII

[Champ Clark, an American congressman, celebrated for his political speeches, was born in Kentucky in 1850. In early life he worked as a farm hand, and did odd jobs in a country store. Subsequently he went to Kentucky University, Bethany College, and the Cincinnati Law School. Settling in Missouri, he began to practice law, and before long had become a noted man in his section of the state, owing to the originality and local color of his Democratic campaign speeches. He was elected to Congress after having held some local offices, and has remained a member of the House ever since, suffering, however, one defeat for reëlection, which he speedily retrieved. The following speech, made in the House in 1898, represents the views of those who regarded unfavorably the annexation of Hawaii to the United States.]

WHY do we desire to expand our territory? It is too large already. You know, Mr. Speaker, with your long service here and your keen powers of observation, that from the beginning of things—*ab urbe conditâ*—the most perplexing questions of legislation, of government, and of politics have grown out of our abnormal size. The largeness of our territory, our wide diversity of soil, climate, employment, and interest, have always been the stumbling-blocks to perfect unity. On this rock—when our area was insignificant compared with what it is now—the constitutional convention of 1787, with George Washington at its head, came near going to pieces. These things caused the most titanic civil war that the world ever saw, which raged with insatiable fury until this republic became another Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted because they were not. These things divide us here now into warring factions, for, loath as we are to admit it, our political differences are in the main founded on issues purely sectional or local.

Vastness of area, wealth of resources, variety of climate, abundance of navigable waters, multitudes of population—these alone are not all the necessary constituent elements from which a great, free, and enduring government must be builded.

Russia has all these galore, and yet she is the veriest despotism on which the sun looks down.

What shall it profit us even temporarily to do this thing? The annexationists draw a picture of these islands in rosy hues, and tell a dulcet story of the free homesteads awaiting us in that tropical region. We are to get the crown lands in return for this four millions we are now appropriating and for the other countless millions which we will expend in the future. As a matter of fact, the crown lands are absolutely worthless. Rest assured that the sugar barons have already secured titles to every foot of land of any value. The free homesteads to be carved out of the crown lands are a fake, pure and simple. All the crown lands which will ever be opened to homestead entry are too dry to till without irrigation, and so high up in the air that irrigation is impossible.

Even if there are valuable crown lands which have never been broken to the plow and fertilized by water, they are not for our children and other white people of our breed, for the all-sufficient reason that they cannot endure outdoor work in that sultry climate. More farming lands there simply mean more Chinese cheap labor, more Chinese contract labor, more Chinese and Japanese slave labor, brought into our country to compete with our free white labor. Such an outrageous and iniquitous performance is forbidden by good morals, as well as by an exalted love of country.

But the annexationists have their plan, like the nigger's coon trap, "set to catch 'em gwine and comin'."

They at first gave it out that the reason we needed the islands was that we could then grow for ourselves all the sugar we wanted, representing that the cane-sugar industry out there was only in its infancy, and could be increased *ad libitum*. That statement so alarmed the sugar-beet enthusiasts that they howled so loud that the annexationists hauled in their horns on the sugar question and declared that they had been mistaken about that, and that what we

really needed the islands for was to raise our own coffee, so that neither Spain nor any other nation could prevent us from having an abundance of that delightful tipple.

Within the last few days the nimble advocates of annexation have abandoned both sugar and coffee as reasons and have found a brand new one—Commodore Dewey's splendid victory at Manila! Since he performed that immortal deed without our owning these islands, they say that it is absolutely necessary for us to buy them in order that we may send reenforcements to him. Suppose Dewey had lost that battle; what then? Do you not know that the annexationists would have been yelling at the top of their voices that we need these islands because of his defeat?

Now, if his great victory proves anything at all about these islands, it is that we have no earthly use for them, for he could not have done any better if we had owned all the islands in all the seas. [Applause.]

We are told that we need these islands as a strategic base in military operations. All the admirals, rear-admirals, commodores, generals, colonels, majors, and captains say so. How does it happen, then, that we have gotten along splendidly for one hundred and nine years without these volcanic rocks? If we did not need them when we were only three millions strong, or only ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or sixty millions strong, why are we likely to perish for want of them now that our census would show 75,000,000 souls? Some of the learned Thebans will do well to address themselves to that question. Have we grown weaker as we have multiplied in population? Certainly no jingo will have the hardihood to maintain a proposition so preposterous. And yet that is precisely the conclusion to which their logic inevitably leads—which is the *reductio ad absurdum*.

I will go as far as any man here or elsewhere in doing all those things necessary to the defense of my country. I permit no man to excel me in patriotism; but I am unwilling to do an unnecessary thing, a dangerous thing, which is proved to be unnecessary by a witness produced to testify in its behalf.

What is our patriotic duty, then? It is as clear as the noonday sun shining in a cloudless sky, and it is this: To hold Pearl Harbor and fortify it to the utmost, even until

it is as strong as Gibraltar, if that be possible. That is the part of patriotism and of wisdom. That removes all the dangers to our institutions. I am willing to vote every dollar necessary for that great work; and the fact that gentlemen will not accept that solution of the question is proof positive that their intention is to make the annexation of these islands the beginning of a general and extensive policy of territorial expansion.

And I warn gentlemen who solemnly aver that they are opposed to the policy of imperial aggrandizement, and yet who advocate this senseless scheme, that when some party in the days to come shall openly declare the whole program they will be stopped by this week's work from objecting. Now is the accepted time for killing this thing. This is the day of salvation.

We are told that we must have an island or we must perish. The jingoes here are as much fascinated by the prospect of having an island as was Sancho Panza. [Laughter.] It was his vision by day and his dream by night, and it brought him nothing but misfortune and unrest. Why this sudden and urgent necessity for an island?

It is said that we need it in case of foreign war, especially in case of war with a great naval power. Is that true or not? Will we never learn anything from experience? How stands the record? We have waged three foreign wars, and come off victors in every one of them, without an island. In two of them we defeated England, the greatest sea power of the world, without an island to our name—once when we were only 3,000,000 strong, and again when we could muster only 12,000,000 men, women, and children, counting the slaves. The strangest part of this glorious history is that the ocean was the very place where we thrashed England the most soundly—without an island. Indeed, had it not been for our victories upon the water and for that matchless achievement of the Iron Soldier of the Hermitage at Chalmette, we would not have been in strictly prime condition for crowing over the war of 1812.

Reflections upon Hull's surrender and the vandal burning of this capitol and the White House are not conducive to a heavenly frame of mind even at this late date. "A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse!" was Hunch-

back Richard's cry on Bosworth field. That certainly was a good stiff price for a charger, but our jingoes are willing to pay a greater price for an island. They are willing to let the Trojan horse into the citadel of our safety. An island is necessary in a time of war, is it? It is a fine thing old Andrew Jackson did not know that, or he might have retreated up the Mississippi and left Pakenham's troops to enjoy at their leisure "the booty and the beauty of New Orleans." I have a question which I wish to ask the mathematical jingo solely for information. If with a handful of raw militia Andrew Jackson in one hour killed 2,600 English soldiers—the picked veterans of the Peninsula—with a loss of only seven killed and eight wounded, without an island, what in Heaven's name would he have done to them if he had only had an island? [Laughter and applause.]

Why is this monstrous proposition made? Let us be plain and state the truth, though it shame the devil. This crime against free government is to be committed for three reasons:—

1. Because some $5,000,000 of Hawaiian bonds have been sold in this country at about thirty cents on the dollar. We are asked to guarantee the payment of four millions of these bonds. The moment we annex the islands those bonds will soar to par, and certain favored patriots possessed of inside information will reap a profit of seventy cents for every thirty cents invested, making a total of $3,500,000—a very comfortable nest-egg to have in the family.

2. There is a pressing necessity for two rotten borough senators to eke out the single gold standard majority at the other end of the capitol.

3. But, above all, William McKinley will have sore need for the three electoral votes of Hawaii in the melancholy days of November in 1900, when he again faces at the polls the great tribune of the people, William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska. [Applause.]

For these base and forbidden ends we are asked to do an act which will jeopardize the American republic.

Mr. Speaker, ever since we could read, you and I and all of us, in our self-gratulations upon the success of our

experiment in representative government, have held up to the scornful gaze of men the farcical elections in Old Sarum, Pocket, Breeches, and other rotten English boroughs. But should we do this foolish, this wicked thing, Johnnie Bull, dull as he is in matters of wit and humor, will have the joke on us and will make us the perpetual butt for his ridicule. The half-dozen voters at Old Sarum were not a lot of nondescript Asiatico-Polynesian ignoramuses, but were Englishmen, habituated to representative government, whose fathers fought at Hastings, at Crécy, and at Agincourt. They belonged to that great Teutonic stock, the imperial race of the world, which for nineteen hundred years has gone forth conquering and to conquer, governing and to govern. But how can we justify either to ourselves or to our posterity the act we are about to commit? How can we endure our shame when a Chinese senator from Hawaii, with his pigtail hanging down his back, with his pagan joss in his hand, shall rise from his curule chair and in pigeon English proceed to chop logic with George Frisbie Hoar or Henry Cabot Lodge? *O tempora! O mores!* [Laughter and applause.]

Then will true patriots—the descendants of the Pilgrims—hide their diminished heads, and in agony of soul exclaim in the language of Truthful James on a celebrated occasion:—

> "Do I sleep? Do I dream?
> Do I wonder and doubt?
> Are things what they seem,
> Or are visions about?
> Is our civilization a failure,
> Or is the Caucasian played out?"

Annexationists, with one accord, will pooh-pooh the idea of danger to the republic, and will solemnly asseverate that the acquisition of Hawaii does not presage further territorial expansion.

Believe them not, Mr. Speaker. Put not your faith in jingoes. Study that strange and intricate machine, the human heart. Consider the unconquerable Anglo-Saxon lust for land. Revolve in your mind whether greed has ever yet set limits to its possessions. Reflect upon the

question whether the rolling snowball grows larger or smaller on its journey down the hill. Gaze on the picture of the Macedonian madman, drunk in the palace of the Babylonian kings, mingling his tears with his wine because there were no more worlds to conquer.

Remember Napoleon's dazzling dream of universal empire, and how he ended dismally, the modern Prometheus bound to the rock of St. Helena with the vulture of ambition preying on his vitals.

Think of the sad plaint of Queen Mary, who so mourned her lost French city as to declare that after death they would find the word "Calais" engraved upon her heart.

Recall the almost incredible story of how Frederick the Great bravely and doggedly waged what to all others seemed a hopeless fight with his multitudinous enemies; during which his fortunes were so desperate and his literary ambition so great that he carried a bottle of corrosive sublimate in one pocket and a ream of his own lame verses in the other; and how at the end of the Seven Years' War all Europe in arms could not wrest Silesia from his iron grasp.

Review the whole history of the human race, and tell us how many rulers have ever willingly alienated one foot of land over which they exercised dominion.

There is only one, and he shines forth a bright particular star among the sovereigns of the earth: the Emperor Adrian, who voluntarily relinquished vast territories, thereby setting bounds to the empire and preserving its life for centuries.

If we annex Hawaii, and you, Mr. Speaker, should preside here twenty years hence, it may be that you will have a polyglot House, and it will be your painful duty to recognize "the gentleman from Patagonia," "the gentleman from Cuba," "the gentleman from Santo Domingo," "the gentleman from Corea," "the gentleman from Hongkong," "the gentleman from Fiji," "the gentleman from Greenland," or, with fear and trembling, "the gentleman from the Cannibal Islands," who will gaze upon you with watering mouth and gleaming teeth. [Great laughter and applause.]

In that stupendous day there will be a new officer within these historic walls, whose title will be "Interpreter to the

Speaker," for your ears will be assailed by speech in as many discordant voices as were heard at the confusion of tongues on the plain of Shinar at the foot of the unfinished Tower of Babel. [Applause.]

For whose benefit and behoof are we to do this preposterous thing? Not for ourselves or our children, surely; for Hawaii has a tropical climate, beneath whose burning, blistering sun no Anglo-American can work outdoors.

Why not learn something from the great historic and scientific fact—for fact it is, though it may be amazing—that Teutonic civilization and representative government are coextensive with the wheat belt? They are exotics in the tropics, and will wither and perish there.

Who is back of this annexation scheme? Who has worked up a sentiment in its favor? Who has maintained a lobby here to labor for its success? Who has enlisted a portion of the public press, and caused it to question the patriotism and cast insinuations against the integrity of the men who have the courage, the wisdom, and the patriotism to fight this colossal job?

I was long since taught that it is a sound practise, when trying to fix responsibility for a crime, to search for the person or persons who would reap the greatest profit from its commission.

Applying that rule of common sense to this case, to what conclusion are we irresistibly led? To this: That the sugar kings of the Sandwich Islands are the chief promoters of the scheme, because they are easily the chief beneficiaries. Even the holders of Hawaiian bonds are not in it with them, because all the bonds ever issued by the Dole government are not equal to the profits which the sugar kings will make out of annexation in each and every year henceforth and forever so long as they shall live, because annexation will make raw Hawaiian sugar come in free, and the sugar kings will pocket the tariff on the same, which amounts, under the blessed Dingley bill, to millions of dollars annually, and will grow as the Hawaiian sugar output increases, and is really a gift from us, which already exceeds $65,000,000.

But it will be answered that reciprocity already lets Hawaiian sugar in free, and therefore the kings have and can have no interest in annexation. Do not believe that for

one moment, Mr. Speaker. The reciprocity treaty is a tip-top thing for the kings, but it is only temporary in its nature, and annexation would be a permanent blessing to them. I do not know much about stocks; I have had no experience with the ticker; but mark my prediction: the moment annexation is an assured fact, sugar stocks will soar skyward—a direction in which their owners will never go. To this low estate have we fallen at last that the sugar kings of the Sandwich Islands force us from the safe, wise, honorable policy of one hundred and nine years into a new, dubious, and untried policy which endangers our prosperity and is a menace to our very existence.

I would not be understood as asserting that members in advocating annexation are consciously influenced by the sugar kings or are in any manner corrupted by them. I am perfectly willing to admit that their motives are absolutely pure. Nevertheless, I believe that the sentiment in favor of annexation now, in the day of William McKinley, under the impulse of which members are rushing upon ills they know not of, is largely the work of the sugar kings, just as the sentiment favorable to annexation in the days of William L. Marcy was distinctively the creation of the propagandists of African slavery. As annexation was resisted and defeated by lovers of human freedom then, so it ought to be resisted and defeated by lovers of human freedom now.

To the Republicans who are shouting for annexation I commend the fine Shakespearian dictum, "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

The Republican party claims now—since emancipation has become popular and since the vote of our "Brother in Black" controls the elections in several close states—that it waged for four years a costly and bloody war to extirpate African slavery from this country. In 1861 the claim was that that awful war was for the preservation of the Union. Indeed, Abraham Lincoln, the greatest of all Republicans, dead or alive, so stated in his famous and wonderful letter to Horace Greeley. So believing, hundreds of thousands of brave, patriotic Democrats helped put down the rebellion, which could not have been put down without them. Now, however, generally, but especially about election time, the seductive tale is whispered in the credulous ears of Afro-

Americans that the Civil War was fought solely to free them, and that nobody did any fighting in the federal armies save and except Republicans; all of which is a fable.

But if the Civil War was carried on to free the negroes, as is now claimed, how can Republicans justify themselves either in the forum of conscience or at the bar of public opinion for annexing the Sandwich Islands, thereby again grafting slavery on to the Republic? No man who has any reputation for veracity will jeopardize it by denying that coolie slavery does exist in the Sandwich Islands to-day as thoroughly as African slavery ever did exist in South Carolina, or in Massachusetts up to the time when it was found to be unprofitable on that stern and rockbound coast. [Applause.] Furthermore, men of intelligence know that Chinese slavery is more brutal and more immoral than was African slavery in its worst estate, even in Massachusetts. It is a matter of common knowledge that Chinese men are sold into slavery, and that Chinese women are sold into and especially prepared by cruel surgical operations and physical mutilations for a species of slavery ten times worse than death itself.

Perhaps it may quicken the consciences, open the eyes, and dampen the ardor of certain jingoes here to know that organized labor is against this annexation scheme. This element, which justly looks to its own interests, and which is more and more every year finding ways to make its influence felt, opposes this Hawaiian job under the impulse of self-preservation, which has been wisely defined as "the first law of nature." The labor organizations of California, being nearest the scene, being at the point of earliest contact, and being the first who would suffer from competition with coolie slave labor, were very properly the first to sound the alarm. They were soon reenforced by an earnest protest from the American Federation of Labor, which demonstrates that working men throughout the land sympathize with their imperiled brethren on the Pacific slope.

The federation places its strong resolution against annexation on the ground that it "would be tantamount to the admission of a slave state, the representatives of which would necessarily work and vote for the enslavement of labor in general."

Members with jingo tendencies will be serving their country, and perhaps themselves, by giving heed to this note of warning, thereby escaping the wrath to come.

The corner-stone of this republic is the proposition enunciated by Thomas Jefferson, the chief priest, apostle, and prophet of constitutional liberty: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

If that proposition is not true, then the American Revolution was a monstrous crime; Washington, Warren, Montgomery, Greene, Marion, and all that band of heroes were turbulent traitors to King George III.; John Hancock, old John Adams, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, and their congressional compeers, pestilent disturbers of the peace; and all the blood shed in our two wars with Great Britain was wanton and wicked waste. If that proposition is not true, William McKinley is this day exercising functions usurped from Victoria Guelph, and this body is composed of mouthy brawlers doing unlawfully those things which the English House of Commons has the sole right to do.

If that proposition is not true, you, Mr. Speaker, are not speaker *de jure*, but only speaker *de facto*, interfering *pro tanto* with the prerogatives of the speaker of the English House of Commons, Mr. Gully, who is the grandson of a professional pugilist. [Laughter and applause.]

This annexation scheme is in flagrant violation of that basic principle of our republic, for many thousand Hawaiians—more than the entire male adult population—have solemnly protested against the sale and delivery of their country to us by a little gang of adventurers who, claiming to be the whole thing, are offering to us a property of which they have robbed the rightful owners. And now America, which has been solemnly declared by the Supreme Court to be a Christian land, is to be made the receiver of these stolen Hawaiian goods.

If an ordinary citizen receives stolen goods, he commits a penitentiary offense. Wherein, I beg leave to inquire, is the difference of principle in stealing ordinary property and in stealing an island or a group of islands, or in receiving them after they are stolen? The only justification lies in the thievish theory that if the theft is big enough, it ceases to be a crime and takes on the character and com-

plexion of a virtue, and the perpetrators thereof, instead of being consigned to the striped uniforms, cramped quarters, meager diet, and hard labor of felons, are to be hailed as statesmen and rewarded with the plaudits of a grateful people—a theory which, I regret to say, is growing in this country.

But the jingoes tell us that this protest of the Hawaiians is all bogus, gotten up by designing knaves, and that the Hawaiians are falling over each other in their eagerness for annexation. If this is true, why not submit this annexation scheme to a popular vote in Hawaii, as was done in the case of Texas, and which was provided for in the treaty once negotiated with Santo Domingo, but which, happily, was never ratified; or have a plebiscite, as Napoleon III. was in the habit of doing whenever he felt like it or wished to cure himself of ennui produced by wearing his uncle's heavy crown, which was too large for him? That would be fair, and would remove one difficulty. Certainly Mr. Sanford B. Dole could guarantee that every vote in favor of annexation would be counted at least once. Does he, or do his sponsors here shrink from the test of Hawaiian manhood suffrage on that proposition?

If a fair election on that proposition cannot be had, what assurance have we that fair elections can be had hereafter, if we annex these islands? If the Hawaiians are not fit to vote on a proposition of vital interest to themselves, who will have the effrontery to say that they are fit to vote for all coming time on propositions of vital interest to us and to our posterity?

If governments do derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, how does it happen that the Hawaiians are to have no voice in a performance which transforms their country from an independent nation into a mere outpost of this republic? Let him answer who can.

This submission to a vote of the Hawaiian male adults of a proposition decisive of their destiny ought to be insisted on by Congress as a condition precedent to even considering annexation. This is the American method of procedure —a method bottomed on the eternal principles of wisdom, justice, and liberty.

We should demand a free ballot and a fair count for the

Hawaiians, whose patrimony has been appropriated by President Dole and his partners in the oligarchy.

The annexation shouters claim that the Hawaiian names appended to the remonstrance are largely fictitious, and chiefly secured as signers under false pretenses. We deny it. Issue is squarely joined on an important matter of fact. It can be settled by a vote of the Hawaiian males over twenty-one years of age. Who can deny that that is a fair test?

All the machinery of elections is in the hands of the little coterie of oligarchists. They are able, resolute, ambitious men. They can be relied upon to see to it that every annexation voter votes, and that his vote is counted. They can also be relied on to see to it that not an unlawful vote is cast against the scheme of annexation, for their fortunes depend upon annexation. Can anything be more clearly just? Is President Dole afraid of the verdict of his own people? I pause for a reply.

None of his friends answer, so I will answer myself. He cannot be induced to submit this scheme to a popular manhood suffrage vote, for the very good reason that he knows that he and his friends hold office through usurpation, and that the vast majority of the Hawaiian people are bitterly opposed to him and all his works. He the friend of liberty, is he? How does it happen, then, that while under the monarchy 14,000 persons were permitted to vote, only 2,800 are given the elective franchise under the oligarchy?

Let it be remembered also that a large percentage of these 2,800 voters have been colonized in Hawaii by Dole and Company, since they have been conducting the government. What a misleading misnomer is it to dignify this little handful of close corporation oligarchists with the name of a republic! What a burlesque upon truth, what a travesty upon justice, what an affront to intelligence, to assert that Dole and his gang have any claims upon us or upon any other friends of representative government and human freedom!

Oh, yes; but we are told that all male citizens of the Sandwich Islands can vote who will swear that they will support the present republic and the present constitution of

Hawaii. Now, at first blush that seems perfectly fair; but it is a delusion and a snare, as will readily appear from this fact: The constitution, which the Hawaiian people never had any hand in adopting, provides for this very scheme of annexation, which the Hawaiian people detest. That condition for voting is a very skilful contrivance. It exhausted human ingenuity to invent it, and is worthy of Machiavelli himself. In order to vote at all, a citizen of the Sandwich Islands must solemnly swear to support a constitution which deprives his country of its nationality. What man who has any reputation to lose will risk it by arising in his place here and declaring that he indorses such a swindle on a feeble people? Under it only about 2,800 persons vote, and that is about the number in favor of annexation.

I put this question to every man in the Republic, of whatever politics: Are you willing that the destinies of your children and your children's children shall be determined in some crisis of your country's fate by the votes of two mongrel senators from Hawaii or three electoral votes from that leprous island? Two votes or less in the Senate and three votes or less in the electoral college have ere this determined matters of great pith and moment. Old John Adams beat Jefferson only three votes in 1796.

Write it on the tablets of your memory that the resolution declaring the War of 1812 passed the Senate by only one majority.

Let it never be forgotten that the greatest crime ever committed on this continent, the rape of the Presidency, was accomplished by only one majority in the electoral college, even after the infamous eight to seven commission had stolen bodily the electoral votes of Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida.

We hear much of "manifest destiny." That is a charming phrase. It tickles the ears of men; it panders to human vanity; it feeds the lurid flames of our ambition; it whets the sword of conquest; it is an anodyne for the troubled conscience, but it lureth to destruction. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. It is, however, no new doctrine. It is as old as the hills, "rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun." Years and years ago, stripped of all disguises and adornments, it was formu-

lated by that eminent annexationist, Rob Roy, in this plain, blunt language:—

> "The good old rule, the simple plan,
> That they should take who have the power,
> And they should keep who can."

Moses placed his veto on this convenient theory of "manifest destiny" when with inspired pen on tables of stone he wrote this stern command, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's lands." Even in this presence, I beg leave to suggest that the Decalogue is a moral code, not for the temporary and exclusive use of the disgruntled children of Israel, footsore and weary with wandering in the wilderness, but is applicable to all persons in all countries and at all times; for the principles of right and wrong are eternal, and do not change with latitude and longitude, or with the lapsing years, or with the various tongues of men.

"Manifest destiny" has been the specious plea of every robber and freebooter since the world began, and will continue to be until the elements shall melt with fervent heat.

It was "manifest destiny" which led Lot to overreach his uncle Abraham in selecting the rich lands of the valley, and you remember the weird story of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The "manifest destiny" of Jacob enabled him to appropriate the birthright of his luckless brother Esau.

"Manifest destiny" led Philip's invincible son across the sea, across the Granicus, even to farthest Ind, to build up an immense empire, which crumbled to pieces at his death.

"Manifest destiny" sent the Roman emperors to the burning sands of Africa, to the impenetrable forests of Gaul, to the inhospitable mountains of Asia, to the bottomless bogs of England, and at last put up the imperial crown for sale at auction to the highest bidder.

"Manifest destiny" caused Bajazet to desolate the fairest portions of Asia, and he ended by being hauled around in an iron cage as a ravening wild beast, which he was.

"Manifest destiny" impelled mad Charles of Sweden to put all northern Europe to the sword until he met his Nemesis in Peter the Great at Pultowa.

"Manifest destiny" was Napoleon's gauzy justification

for all the bones bleaching from Toulon to Mount St. Jean. He was always prating about his star; but it disappeared forever in the sunken road of Ohain, and he wandered from the stricken field "the immense somnambulist of a shattered dream."

"Manifest destiny" makes England the great bully of the world, oppressing the weak, toadying to the strong, laying up wrath against that day of wrath, that *dies iræ*, which is as sure to come for her as that a just God reigns on high.

Oh, yes! "Manifest destiny" is a seductive thing. It is the beautiful, the irresistible, the wicked Circe beckoning us on to our undoing. The entire pathway of man since the day when Adam was driven from Eden with flaming swords is black with the wrecks of nations who hearkened to the siren song of "Manifest destiny," and the epitaph upon whose tombstones is "They were, but they are not."

Hitherto we have been the favorites of Heaven; but let us not tempt fate too far or destiny will grow weary of partnership with us and dissolve it as she did with Napoleon at Waterloo.

Hawaii is a blind for our eyes, a snare for our feet, a bait for our cupidity, the will-o'-the-wisp which will lead us into the Slough of Despond, the bewitching, scheming, treacherous Delilah destined to shear our Samson of his leonine locks and to deliver him bound hand and foot into the power of the Philistines.

Hawaii is the fly which will make our whole pot of ointment stink in the nostrils of the civilized world.

Let us put away this supreme temptation from before our faces, and generations yet unborn will bless us for this act of wisdom, self-abnegation, and patriotism.

Nature has set bounds to this magnificent republic beyond which she should not go—the Atlantic on the east, the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande on the south, the Pacific on the west, and in the fulness of time, without the expenditure of a dollar or the spilling of one drop of blood or the shedding of a single tear, the frozen ocean on the north.

Within those wide, extended limits we will live and grow and flourish, the happiest, the richest, the most puis-

sant, the most intelligent, the securest people on the whole face of the earth.

But depart from the plan of justice, of wisdom, and of moderation, go chasing the *ignis fatuus* of "manifest destiny" over land and over sea, and some day Macaulay's artistic New Zealander, after finishing his picture of the ruins of St. Paul's, will sit on a broken arch of "the Long Bridge" and sketch the ruins of this capitol. Before you consummate this monstrous folly, I say to you, in the language of Galgacus to the ancient Britons, "Think of your forefathers; think of your posterity!" [Prolonged applause.]

HENRY CLAY

DICTATORS IN AMERICAN POLITICS

[Henry Clay was born in Hanover County, Va., 1777. Left alone at an early age, he had very few educational advantages, and what he possessed of learning was acquired by reading. In 1797 he removed to Lexington, Ky., and began to practice law. In 1803 he became a member of the legislature. In 1811 he was again elected to the House of Representatives. He was chosen as speaker, and held the office from the twelfth to the sixteenth Congress inclusive. He belonged to the Young Republican party that forced the declaration of war with England in 1812, but became one of the peace commissioners who negotiated the treaty at Ghent in 1814. The further work of that mission was the negotiating a treaty of commerce with England, after effecting which he returned to America in 1815, and reëntered Congress, where, in the slavery agitation beginning in 1819, he became the most ardent supporter of the measure known as the Missouri Compromise, that became a law in 1821. In 1831 he entered the U. S. Senate, where with the compromise tariff measure of 1833 he earned the title of the "Great Pacificator." He died at Washington, June 29, 1852. The first of the following speeches was delivered in the Senate in 1834; the second and third, also in the Senate, in 1832 and 1850, respectively; the fourth and fifth, in the House of Representatives, in 1818 and 1819.]

NEVER, Mr. President, have I known or read of an administration which expires with so much agony, and so little composure and resignation, as that which now, unfortunately, has the control of public affairs in this country. It exhibits a state of mind feverish, fretful, and fidgety, bounding recklessly from one desperate expedient to another, without any sober or settled purpose. Ever since the dog days of last summer it has been making a succession of the most extravagant plunges, of which the extraordinary cabinet paper, a sort of appeal from a dissenting cabinet to the people, was the first; and the protest,

a direct appeal from the Senate to the people, is the last and the worst.

A new philosophy has sprung up within a few years past called phrenology. There is, I believe, something in it, but not quite as much as its ardent followers proclaim. According to its doctrines, the leading passion, propensity, and characteristics of every man are developed in his physical conformation, chiefly in the structure of his head. Gall and Spurzheim, its founders, or most eminent propagators, being dead, I regret that neither of them can examine the head of our illustrious chief magistrate. But if it could be surveyed by Dr. Caldwell of Transylvania University, I am persuaded that he would find the organ of destructiveness prominently developed. Except an enormous fabric of executive power for himself, the President has built up nothing, constructed nothing, and will leave no enduring monument of his administration. He goes for destruction, universal destruction, and it seems to be his greatest ambition to efface and obliterate every trace of the wisdom of his predecessors. He has displayed this remarkable trait throughout his whole life, whether in private walks or in the public service. He signally and gloriously exhibited that peculiar organ when contending against the enemies of his country in the battle of New Orleans. For that brilliant exploit no one has ever been more ready than myself to award him all due honor. At the head of our armies was his appropriate position, and most unfortunate for his fame was the day when he entered on the career of administration as the chief executive officer. He lives by excitement, perpetual, agitating excitement, and would die in a state of perfect repose and tranquillity. He has never been without some subject of attack, either in individuals, or in masses, or in institutions. I myself have been one of his favorites, and I do not know but that I have recently recommended myself to his special regard. During his administration this has been his constant course. The Indians and Indian policy, internal improvements, the colonial trade, the Supreme Court, Congress, the bank, have successively experienced the attacks of his haughty and imperious spirit. And if he tramples the bank in the dust, my word for it, we shall see him quickly in chase of some new subject of his

vengeance. This is the genuine spirit of conquerors and of conquest. It is said by the biographer of Alexander the Great that, after he had completed his Asiatic conquests, he seemed to sigh because there were no more worlds for him to subdue; and, finding himself without further employment for his valor or his arms, he turned within himself to search the means to gratify his insatiable thirst of glory. What sort of conquest he achieved of himself the same biographer tragically records.

Already has the President singled out and designated, in the Senate of the United States, the new object of his hostile pursuit; and the protest which I am now to consider is his declaration of war. What has provoked it? The Senate, a component part of the Congress of the United States, at its last adjournment left the Treasury of the United States in the safe custody of the persons and places assigned by law to keep it. Upon reassembling, it found the treasure removed; some of its guardians displaced; all, remaining, brought under the immediate control of the President's sole will; and the President having free and unobstructed access to the public money. The Senate believes that the purse of the nation is, by the Constitution and laws, entrusted to the exclusive legislative care of Congress. It has dared to avow and express this opinion, in a resolution adopted on the twenty-eighth of March last. That resolution was preceded by a debate of three months' duration, in the progress of which the able and zealous supporters of the executive in the Senate were attentively heard. Every argument which their ample resources, or those of the members of the executive, could supply was listened to with respect and duly weighed. After full deliberation, the Senate expressed its conviction that the executive had violated the Constitution and laws. It cautiously refrained, in the resolution, from all examination into the motives or intention of the executive; it ascribed no bad ones to him; it restricted itself to a simple declaration of its solemn belief that the Constitution and laws had been violated. This is the extent of the offense of the Senate. This is what it has done to excite the executive indignation and to bring upon it the infliction of a denunciatory protest.

The President comes down upon the Senate and demands that it record upon its journal this protest. He recommends no measure—no legislation whatever. He proposes no executive proceeding on the part of the Senate. He requests the recording of his protest, and he requests nothing more nor less. The Senate has abstained from putting on its own record any vindication of the resolution of which the President complains. It has not asked of him to place it where he says he has put his protest, in the archives of the executive. He desires, therefore, to be done for him, on the journal of the Senate, what has not been done for itself. The Senate keeps no recording office for protests, deeds, wills, or other instruments. The Constitution enjoins that "each house shall keep a journal of its proceedings." In conformity with this requirement, the Senate does keep a journal of its proceedings—not the proceedings of the executive or any other department of the government, except so far as they relate directly to the business of the Senate. The President sometimes professes to favor a strict construction of the Constitution, at least in regard to the powers of all the departments of the government other than that of which he is the chief. As to that, he is the greatest latitudinarian that has ever filled the office of President. Upon any fair construction of the Constitution, how can the Senate be called upon to record upon its journal any proceedings but its own? It is true that the ordinary messages of the President are usually inserted at large in the journal. Strictly speaking, it perhaps ought never to have been done; but they have been heretofore registered, because they relate to the general business of the Senate, either in its legislative or executive character, and have been the basis of subsequent proceedings. The protest stands upon totally distinct ground.

The President professes to consider himself as charged by the resolution with "the high crime of violating the laws and Constitution of my country." He declares that "one of the most important branches of the government, in its official capacity, in a public manner, and by its recorded sentence, but without precedent, competent authority, or just cause, declares him guilty of a breach of the laws and Constitution." The protest further alleges that such an

act as the Constitution describes "constitutes a high crime —one of the highest, indeed, which the President can commit—a crime which justly exposes him to an impeachment by the House of Representatives; and, upon due conviction, to removal from office, and to the complete and immutable disfranchisement prescribed by the Constitution." It also asserts: "The resolution, then, was an impeachment of the President, and in its passage amounts to a declaration by a majority of the Senate that he is guilty of an impeachable offense." The President is also of opinion that to say that the resolution does not expressly allege that the assumption of power and authority which it condemns was intentional and corrupt, is no answer to the preceding view of its character and effect. The act thus condemned necessarily implies volition and design in the individual to whom it is imputed; and, being lawful in its character, the legal conclusion is, that it was prompted by improper motives and committed with an unlawful intent." . . . "The President of the United States, therefore, has been, by a majority of his constitutional triers, accused and found guilty of an impeachable offense."

Such are the deliberate views entertained by the President of the implications, effects, and consequences of the resolution. It is scarcely necessary to say that they are totally different from any which were entertained by the Senate or by the mover of the resolution. The Senate carefully abstained from looking into the *quo animo*, from all examination into the motives or intention with which the violation of the Constitution and laws was made. No one knows those motives and intentions better than the President himself. If he chooses to supply the omission of the resolution, if he thinks proper to pronounce his own self-condemnation, his guilt does not flow from what the Senate has done, but from his own avowal. Having cautiously avoided passing upon his guilt by prejudgment, so neither ought his acquittal to be pronounced by anticipation.

But, I would ask, in what tone, temper, and spirit does the President come to the Senate? As a great state culprit who has been arraigned at the bar of justice, or sentenced as guilty? Does he manifest any of those compunctious visitings of conscience which a guilty violator of the Con-

stitution and laws of the land ought to feel? Does he address himself to a high court with the respect, to say nothing of humility, which a person accused or convicted would naturally feel? No, no. He comes as if the Senate were guilty, as if he were in the judgment seat, and the Senate stood accused before him. He arraigns the Senate; puts it upon trial; condemns it; he comes as if he felt himself elevated far above the Senate, and beyond all reach of the law, surrounded by unapproachable impunity. He who professes to be an innocent and injured man gravely accuses the Senate, and modestly asks it to put upon its own record his sentence of condemnation! When before did the arraigned or convicted party demand of the court which was to try, or had condemned him, to enter upon their records a severe denunciation of their own conduct? The President presents himself before the Senate, not in the garb of suffering innocence, but in the imperial and royal costume—as a dictator, to rebuke a refractory Senate; to command it to record his solemn protest; to chastise it for disobedience.

> "The hearts of princes kiss obedience,
> So much they love it; but to stubborn spirits
> They swell, and grow as terrible as storms."

We shall better comprehend the nature of the request which the President has made of the Senate, by referring to his own opinions expressed in the protest. He says that the resolution is a recorded sentence, "but without precedent, just cause, or competent authority." He "is perfectly convinced that the discussion and passage of the above-mentioned resolutions were not only unauthorized by the Constitution, but in many respects repugnant to its provisions, and subversive of the rights secured by it to other coordinate departments." We had no right, it seems, then, even to discuss, much less express, any opinion on the President's proceedings encroaching upon our constitutional powers. And what right had the President to look at all into our discussions? What becomes of the constitutional provision which, speaking of Congress, declares, "for any speech or debate in either house, they shall not be questioned in any other place"?

The President thinks "the resolution of the Senate is wholly unauthorized by the Constitution, and in derogation of its entire spirit." He proclaims that the passage, recording, and promulgation of the resolution affixes guilt and disdisgrace to the President, "in a manner unauthorized by the Constitution." But, says the President, if the Senate had just cause to entertain the belief that the House of Representatives would not impeach him, that cannot justify "the assumption by the Senate of powers not conferred by the Constitution." The protest continues: "It is only necessary to look at the condition in which the Senate and the President have been placed by this proceeding, to perceive its utter incompatibility with the provisions and the spirit of the Constitution, and with the plainest dictates of humanity and justice." A majority of the Senate assume the function which belongs to the House of Representatives, and "convert themselves into accusers, witnesses, counsel, and judges, and prejudge the whole case." If the House of Representatives shall consider that there is no cause of impeachment, and prefer none, "then will the violation of privilege as it respects that house, of justice as it regards the President, and of the Constitution as it relates to both, be more conspicuous and impressive." The Senate is charged with the "unconstitutional power of arraigning and censuring the official conduct of the executive." The people, says the protest, will be compelled to adopt the conclusion, "either that the Chief Magistrate was unworthy of their respect, or that the Senate was chargeable with calumny and injustice." There can be no doubt which branch of this alternative was intended to be applied. The President throughout the protest labors to prove himself worthy of all respect from the people. Finally the President says: "It is due to the high trust with which I have been charged, to those who may be called to succeed me in it, to the representatives of the people whose constitutional prerogative has been unlawfully assumed, to the people and to the states, and to the Constitution they have established, that I should not permit its provisions to be broken down by such an attack on the executive department, without at least some effort 'to preserve, protect, and defend them.'"

These are the opinions which the President expresses in

the protest of the conduct of the Senate. In every form, and every variety of expression, he accuses it of violating the express language and spirit of the Constitution; of encroaching not only on his prerogatives, but those of the House of Representatives; of forgetting the sacred character and impartiality which belong to the highest court of justice in the Union; of injustice, of inhumanity, and of calumny. And we are politely requested to spread upon our own journal these opinions entertained of us by the President, that they may be perpetually preserved and handed down to posterity! The President respectfully requests it! He might as well have come to us and respectfully requested us to allow him to pull our noses, or kick us, or receive his stripes upon our backs. The degradation would not have been much more humiliating.

The President tells us, in the same protest, that any breach or violation of the Constitution and laws draws after it, and necessarily implies, volition and design, and that the legal conclusion is that it was prompted by improper motives and committed with an unlawful intent. He pronounces, therefore, that the Senate, in the violations of the Constitution which he deliberately imputes to it, is guilty; that volition and design, on the part of the Senate, are necessarily implied; and that the legal conclusion is that the Senate was prompted by improper motives, and committed the violation with an unlawful intent. And he most respectfully and kindly solicits the Senate to overleap the restraint of the Constitution which limits its journal to the record of its own proceedings, and place alongside of them his sentence of condemnation of the Senate.

That the President did not intend to make the journal of the Senate a medium of conveying his sentiments to the people is manifest. He knows perfectly well how to address to them his appeals. And the remarkable fact is established, by his private secretary, that, simultaneously with the transmission to the Senate of his protest, a duplicate was transmitted to the "Globe," his official paper, for publication; and it was forthwith published accordingly. For what purpose, then, was it sent here? It is painful to avow the belief, but one is compelled to think it was only sent in a spirit of insult and defiance.

The President is not content with vindicating his own rights. He steps forward to maintain the privileges of the House of Representatives also. Why? Was it to make the House his ally, and to excite its indignation against the offending Senate? Is not the House perfectly competent to sustain its own privileges against every assault? I should like to see, sir, a resolution introduced into the House, alleging a breach of its privileges by a resolution of the Senate, which was intended to maintain unviolated the constitutional rights of both houses in regard to the public purse, and to be present at its discussion.

The President exhibits great irritation and impatience at the presumptuousness of a resolution which, without the imputation of any bad intention or design, ventures to allege that he has violated the Constitution and laws. His constitutional and official infallibility must not be questioned. To controvert it is an act of injustice, inhumanity, and calumny. He is treated as a criminal, and, without summons, he is prejudged, condemned, and sentenced. Is the President scrupulously careful of the memory of the dead, or the feelings of the living, in respect to violations of the Constitution? If a violation by him implies criminal guilt, a violation by them cannot be innocent and guiltless. And how has the President treated the memory of the immortal Father of his Country—that great man who, for purity of purpose and character, wisdom and moderation, unsullied virtue and unsurpassed patriotism, is without competition in past history or among living men, and whose equal we scarcely dare hope will ever be again presented as a blessing to mankind? How has he been treated by the President? Has he not again and again pronounced that, by approving the bill chartering the first Bank of the United States, Washington violated the Constitution of his country? That violation, according to the President, included volition and design, was prompted by improper motives, and was committed with an unlawful intent. It was the more inexcusable in Washington, because he assisted and presided in the convention which formed the Constitution. If it be unjust to arraign, try unheard, and condemn as guilty, a living man filling an exalted office, with all the splendor, power, and influence which that office possesses,

how much more cruel is it to disturb the sacred and venerated ashes of the illustrious dead, who can raise no voice and make no protests against the imputation of high crime!

What has been the treatment of the President toward that other illustrious man, yet spared to us, but who is lingering upon the very verge of eternity? Has he abstained from charging the Father of the Constitution with criminal intent in violating the Constitution? Mr. Madison, like Washington, assisted in the formation of the Constitution; was one of its ablest expounders and advocates; and was opposed, on constitutional ground, to the first Bank of the United States. But, yielding to the force of circumstances, and especially to the great principle that the peace and stability of human society require that a controverted question, which has been finally settled by all the departments of government by long acquiescence, and by the people themselves, should not be open to perpetual dispute and disturbance, he approved the bill chartering the present Bank of the United States. Even the name of James Madison, which is but another for purity, patriotism, profound learning, and enlightened experience, cannot escape the imputations of his present successor.

And, lastly, how often has he charged Congress itself with open violations of the Constitution? Times almost without number. During the present session he has sent in a message, in regard to the land bill, in which he has charged it with an undisguised violation—a violation so palpable that it is not even disguised, and must, therefore, necessarily imply a criminal intent. Sir, the advisers of the President, whoever they are, deceive him and themselves. They have vainly supposed that, by an appeal to the people and an exhibition of the wounds of the President, they could enlist the sympathies and the commiseration of the people—that the name of Andrew Jackson would bear down the Senate and all opposition. They have yet to learn, what they will soon learn, that even a good and responsible name may be used so frequently, as an indorser, that its credit and the public confidence in its solidity have been seriously impaired. They mistake the intelligence of the people, who are not prepared to see and sanction the President putting forth indiscriminate charges of a violation of

the Constitution against whomsoever he pleases, and exhibiting unmeasured rage and indignation when his own infallibility is dared to be questioned.

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

Mr. President: In one sentiment expressed by the honorable gentleman from South Carolina [General Hayne], though perhaps not in the sense intended by him, I entirely concur. I agree with him, that the decision on the system of policy embraced in this debate involves the future destiny of this growing country. One way, I verily believe, it would lead to deep and general distress, general bankruptcy, and national ruin, without benefit to any part of the Union; the other, the existing prosperity will be preserved and augmented, and the nation will continue rapidly to advance in wealth, power, and greatness, without prejudice to any section of the confederacy.

Thus viewing the question, I stand here as the humble but zealous advocate, not of the interests of one state, or seven states only, but of the whole Union. And never before have I felt more intensely the overpowering weight of that share of responsibility which belongs to me in these deliberations. Never before have I had more occasion than I now have to lament my want of those intellectual powers, the possession of which might enable me to unfold to this Senate, and to illustrate to this people, great truths, intimately connected with the lasting welfare of my country. I should, indeed, sink overwhelmed and subdued beneath the appalling magnitude of the task which lies before me, if I did not feel myself sustained and fortified by a thorough consciousness of the justness of the cause which I have espoused, and by a persuasion, I hope not presumptuous, that it has the approbation of that Providence who has so often smiled upon these United States.

Eight years ago it was my painful duty to present to the other House of Congress an unexaggerated picture of the general distress pervading the whole land. We must all yet remember some of its frightful features. We all know that

the people were then oppressed and borne down by an enormous load of debt; that the value of property was at the lowest point of depression; that ruinous sales and sacrifices were everywhere made of real estate; that stop laws, and relief laws, and paper money were adopted to save the people from impending destruction; that a deficit in the public revenue existed, which compelled government to seize upon, and divert from its legitimate object, the appropriations to the sinking fund, to redeem the national debt; and that our commerce and navigation were threatened with a complete paralysis. In short, sir, if I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present Constitution, which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and desolation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the tariff of 1824.

I have now to perform the more pleasing task of exhibiting an imperfect sketch of the existing state of the unparalleled prosperity of the country. On a general survey, we behold cultivation extended, the arts flourishing, the face of the country improved, our people fully and profitably employed, and the public countenance exhibiting tranquillity, contentment, and happiness. And if we descend into particulars, we have the agreeable contemplation of a people out of debt, land rising slowly in value, but in a secure and salutary degree; a ready, though not extravagant, market for all the surplus productions of our industry; innumerable flocks and herds browsing and gamboling on ten thousand hills and plains, covered with rich and verdant grasses; our cities expanded, and whole villages springing up, as it were, by enchantment; our exports and imports increasing and increasing; our tonnage, foreign and coastwise, swelling, and fully occupied; the rivers of our interior animated by perpetual thunder and lightning of countless steamboats; the currency sound and abundant; the public debt of two wars nearly redeemed; and, to crown all, the public treasury overflowing, embarrassing Congress, not to find subjects of taxation, but to select the objects which shall be liberated from the impost. If the term of seven years were to be selected, of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the establishment of their

present Constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824.

This transformation of the condition of the country, from gloom and distress to brightness and prosperity, has been mainly the work of American legislation, fostering American industry, instead of allowing it to be controlled by foreign legislation, cherishing foreign industry. The foes of the American System, in 1824, with great boldness and confidence, predicted: First, the ruin of the public revenue, and the *creation of a necessity* to resort to direct taxation. The gentleman from South Carolina [General Hayne], I believe, thought that the tariff of 1824 would operate a reduction of revenue to the large amount of eight millions of dollars. Second, the destruction of our navigation. Third, the desolation of commercial cities. And, fourth, the augmentation of the price of objects of consumption, and further decline in that of the articles of our exports. Every prediction which they made has failed—utterly failed. Instead of the ruin of the public revenue, with which they then sought to deter us from the adoption of the American System, we are now threatened with its subversion, and the vast amount of the public revenue produced by that system. Every branch of our navigation has increased.

While we thus behold the entire failure of all that was foretold against the system, it is a subject of just felicitation to its friends that all their anticipations of its benefits have been fulfilled, or are in progress of fulfilment. The honorable gentleman from South Carolina has made an allusion to a speech made by me, in 1824, in the other house, in support of the tariff, and to which, otherwise, I should not have particularly referred. But I would ask any one who can now command the courage to pursue that long production, what principle there laid down is not true? What prediction then made has been falsified by practical experience?

It is now proposed to abolish the system to which we owe so much of the public prosperity, and it is urged that the arrival of the period of the redemption of the public debt has been confidently looked to as presenting a suitable occasion to rid the country of evils with which the system is alleged to be fraught. Not an inattentive observer of

passing events, I have been aware that, among those who were most early in pressing the payment of the public debt, and upon that ground were opposing appropriations to other great interests, there were some who cared less about the debt than the accomplishment of other objects. But the people of the United States have not coupled the payment of *their* public debt with the destruction of the protection of *their* industry, against foreign laws and foreign industry. They have been accustomed to regard the extinction of the public debt as relief from a burthen, and not as the infliction of a curse. If it is to be attended or followed by the subversion of the American System, and an exposure of our establishments and our productions to the unguarded consequences of the selfish policy of foreign powers, the payment of the public debt will be the bitterest of curses. Its fruit will be like the fruit

> "Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
> With loss of Eden."

If the system of protection be founded on principles erroneous in theory, pernicious in practise—above all, if it be unconstitutional, as is alleged, it ought to be forthwith abolished, and not a vestige of it suffered to remain. But, before we sanction this sweeping denunciation, let us look a little at this system, its magnitude, its ramifications, its duration, and the high authorities which have sustained it. We shall see that its foes will have accomplished comparatively nothing after having achieved their present aim of breaking down our iron foundries, our woolen, cotton, and hemp manufactories, and our sugar plantations. The destruction of these would, undoubtedly, lead to the sacrifice of immense capital, the ruin of many thousands of our fellow citizens, and incalculable loss to the whole community. But their prostration would not disfigure, nor produce greater effect upon the *whole* system of protection, in all its branches, than the destruction of the beautiful domes upon the capitol would occasion to the magnificent edifice which they surmount. Why, sir, there is scarcely an interest, scarcely a vocation in society, which is not embraced by the beneficence of this system.

It comprehends our coasting tonnage and trade, from which all foreign tonnage is absolutely excluded.

It includes all our foreign tonnage, with the inconsiderable exception made by treaties of reciprocity with a few foreign powers.

It embraces our fisheries, and all our hardy and enterprising fishermen.

It extends to almost every mechanic art.

It extends to all lower Louisiana, the delta of which might as well be submerged again in the Gulf of Mexico, from which it has been a gradual conquest, as now to be deprived of the protecting duty upon its great staple.

It affects the cotton planter himself, and tobacco planter, both of whom enjoy protection.

Such are some of the items of this vast system of protection, which it is now proposed to abandon. We might well pause and contemplate, if human imagination could conceive the extent of mischief and ruin from its total overthrow, before we proceed to the work of destruction. Its duration is worthy, also, of serious consideration. Not to go behind the Constitution, its date is coeval with that instrument. It began on the ever memorable fourth day of July—the fourth day of July, 1789. The second act which stands recorded in the statute book, bearing the illustrious signature of George Washington, laid the corner-stone of the whole system. That there might be no mistake about the matter, it was then solemnly proclaimed to the American people, and to the world, that it was *necessary*, for "the encouragement and *protection* of manufactures," that duties should be laid. It is in vain to urge the small amount of the measure of the protection thus extended. The great principle was then established by the fathers of the Constitution, with the Father of his Country at their head. And it cannot now be questioned that, if the government had not then been new, and the subject untried, a greater measure of protection would have been applied, if it had been supposed necessary. Shortly after, the master minds of Jefferson and Hamilton were brought to act on this interesting subject. Taking views of it appertaining to the departments of foreign affairs and of the treasury, which they respectively filled, they presented,

severally, reports which yet remain monuments of their profound wisdom, and came to the same conclusion of protection to American industry. Mr. Jefferson argued that foreign restrictions, foreign prohibitions, and foreign high duties ought to be met at home by American restrictions, American prohibitions, and American high duties. Mr. Hamilton, surveying the entire ground, and looking at the inherent nature of the subject, treated it with an ability which, if ever equaled, has not been surpassed, and earnestly recommended protection.

The wars of the French Revolution commenced about this period, and streams of gold poured into the United States through a thousand channels, opened or enlarged by the successful commerce which our neutrality enabled us to prosecute. We forgot, or overlooked, in the general prosperity, the necessity of encouraging our domestic manufactures. Then came the edicts of Napoleon, and the British orders in council; and our embargo, non-intercourse, non-importation, and war, followed, in rapid succession. These national measures, amounting to a total suspension, for the period of their duration, of our foreign commerce, afforded the most efficacious encouragement to American manufacturers; and, accordingly, they everywhere sprung up. While these measures of restriction, and this state of war continued, the manufacturers were stimulated in their enterprise by every assurance of support, by public sentiment, and by legislative resolves. It was about that period (1808) that South Carolina bore her high testimony to the wisdom of the policy, in an act of her Legislature, the preamble of which, now before me, reads:

"Whereas, the establishment and *encouragement* of domestic manufactures is conducive to the interests of a state, by adding new *incentives to industry*, and as being the means of disposing to advantage the surplus productions of the *agriculturist;* and, whereas, in the present unexampled state of the world, their establishment in our country is not only *expedient*, but politic in rendering us *independent* of foreign nations."

The Legislature, not being competent to afford the most efficacious aid, by imposing duties on foreign rival articles, proceeded to incorporate a company.

Peace, under the Treaty of Ghent, returned in 1815, but there did not return with it the golden days which preceded the edicts leveled at our commerce by Great Britain and France. It found all Europe tranquilly resuming the arts and business of civil life. It found Europe no longer the consumer of our surplus and the employer of our navigation, but excluding, or heavily burthening, almost all the productions of our agriculture, and our rivals in manufactures, in navigation, and in commerce. It found our country, in short, in a situation totally different from all the past—new and untried. It became necessary to adapt our laws, and especially our laws of impost, to the new circumstances in which we found ourselves. Accordingly, that eminent and lamented citizen, then at the head of the treasury [Mr. Dallas], was required, by a resolution of the House of Representatives, under date the twenty-third day of February, 1815, to prepare and report to the succeeding session of Congress a system of revenue conformable with the actual condition of the country. He had the circle of a whole year to perform the work, consulted merchants, manufacturers, and other practical men, and opened an extensive correspondence. The report which he made at the session of 1816 was the result of his inquiries and reflections, and embodies the principles which he thought applicable to the subject. It has been said that the tariff of 1816 was a measure of mere revenue, and that it only reduced the war duties to a peace standard. It is true that the question then was, how much and in what way should the double duties of the war be reduced. Now, also, the question is, on what articles shall the duties be reduced so as to subject the amounts of the future revenue to the wants of the Government. Then it was deemed an inquiry of the first importance, as it should be now, how the reduction should be made, so as to secure proper encouragement to our domestic industry. That this was a leading object in the arrangement of the tariff of 1816 I well remember, and it is demonstrated by the language of Mr. Dallas. He says in his report:

"There are few, if any, governments which do not regard the establishment of domestic manufactures as a chief object of public policy.

The United States have *always* so regarded it. The demands of the country, while the acquisition of supplies from foreign nations was either prohibited or impracticable, may have afforded sufficient inducement for this investment of capital, and this application of labor; but the inducement, in its necessary extent, must fail when the day of *competition* returns. Upon that change in the condition of the country, the preservation of the manufactures, which private citizens, under favorable auspices, have constituted the property of the nation, becomes a consideration of general policy, to be resolved by a recollection of past embarrassments; by the certainty of an increased difficulty of reinstating, upon any emergency, the manufactures which shall be allowed to perish and pass away," etc.

The measure of protection which he proposed was not adopted in regard to some leading articles, and there was great difficulty in ascertaining what it ought to have been. But the *principle* was then distinctly asserted, and fully sanctioned.

The subject of the American System was again brought up in 1820, by the bill reported by the chairman of the committee of manufactures, now a member of the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the principle was successfully maintained by the representatives of the people; but the bill which they passed was defeated in the Senate. It was revived in 1824, the whole ground carefully and deliberately explored, and the bill then introduced, receiving all the sanctions of the Constitution, became the law of the land. An amendment of the system was proposed in 1828, to the history of which I refer with no agreeable recollections. The bill of that year, in some of its provisions, was framed on principles directly adverse to the declared wishes of the friends of the policy of protection. I have heard, without vouching for the fact, that it was so framed, upon the advice of a prominent citizen, now abroad, with the view of ultimately defeating the bill, and with assurance that, being altogether unacceptable to the friends of the American System, the bill would be lost. Be that as it may, the most exceptional features of the bill were stamped upon it, against the earnest remonstrances of the friends of the system, by the votes of Southern members, upon a principle, I think, as unsound in legislation as it is reprehensible in ethics. The bill was passed, notwith-

standing all this, it having been deemed better to take the bad along with the good which it contained, than reject it altogether. Subsequent legislation has corrected the error then perpetrated, but still that measure is vehemently denounced by gentlemen who contributed to make it what it was.

Thus, sir, has this great system of protection been gradually built, stone upon stone and step by step, from the fourth of July, 1789, down to the present period. In every stage of its progress it has received the deliberate sanction of Congress. A vast majority of the people of the United States has approved and continue to approve it. Every Chief Magistrate of the United States, from Washington to the present, in some form or other, has given to it the authority of his name; and, however the opinions of the existing President are interpreted south of Mason's and Dixon's line, on the north they are at least understood to favor the establishment of a *judicious* tariff.

The question, therefore, which we are now called upon to determine, is not whether we shall establish a new and doubtful system of policy, just proposed, and for the first time presented to our consideration, but whether we shall break down and destroy a long-established system, patiently and carefully built up and sanctioned, during a series of years, again and again, by the nation, and its highest and most revered authorities. Are we not bound deliberately to consider whether we can proceed to this work of destruction without a violation of the public faith? The people of the United States have justly supposed that the policy of protecting their industry against foreign legislation and foreign industry was fully settled, not by a single act, but by repeated and deliberate acts of government, performed at distant and frequent intervals. In full confidence that the policy was firmly and unchangeably fixed, thousands upon thousands have invested their capital, purchased a vast amount of real and other estate, made permanent establishments, and accommodated their industry. Can we expose to utter and irretrievable ruin this countless multitude, without justly incurring the reproach of violating the national faith?

Such are the origin, duration, extent, and sanctions of

the policy which we are now called upon to subvert. Its beneficial effects, although they may vary in degree, have been felt in all parts of the Union. To none, I verily believe, has it been prejudicial. In the North, everywhere, testimonials are borne to the high prosperity which it has diffused. There all branches of industry are animated and flourishing: commerce, foreign and domestic, active; cities and towns springing up, enlarging, and beautifying; navigation fully and profitably employed, and the whole face of the country smiling with improvement, cheerfulness, and abundance.

When gentlemen have succeeded in their design of an immediate or gradual destruction of the American System, what is their substitute? Free trade. Free trade! The call for free trade is as unavailing as the cry of a spoiled child, in its nurse's arms, for the moon, or the stars that glitter in the firmament of heaven. It never has existed, it never will exist. Trade implies at least two parties. To be free, it should be fair, equal, and reciprocal. But if we throw our ports wide open to the admission of foreign productions, free of all duty, what ports of any other foreign nation shall we find open to the free admission of our surplus produce? We may break down all barriers to free trade on our part, but the work will not be complete until foreign powers shall have removed theirs. There would be freedom on one side, and restrictions, prohibitions, and exclusions on the other. The bolts, and the bars, and the chains of all other nations will remain undisturbed. It is, indeed, possible that our industry and commerce would accommodate themselves to this unequal and unjust state of things; for, such is the flexibility of our nature, that it bends itself to all circumstances. The wretched prisoner incarcerated in a jail, after a long time becomes reconciled to his solitude, and regularly notches down the passing days of his confinement.

Gentlemen deceive themselves. It is not free trade that they are recommending to our acceptance. It is, in effect, the British colonial system that we are invited to adopt; and, if their policy prevail, it will lead, substantially, to the recolonization of these states, under the commercial dominion of Great Britain. And whom do we find some of the

principal supporters, out of Congress, of this foreign system? Mr. President, there are some foreigners who always remain exotics, and never become naturalized in our country, while, happily, there are many others who readily attach themselves to our principles and our institutions. The honest, patient, and industrious German readily unites with our people, establishes himself upon some of our fat land, fills his capacious barn, and enjoys, in tranquillity, the abundant fruits which his diligence gathers around him, always ready to fly to the standard of his adopted country, or of its laws, when called by the duties of patriotism. The gay, the versatile, the philosophic Frenchman, accommodating himself cheerfully to all the vicissitudes of life, incorporates himself without difficulty in our society. But of all foreigners, none amalgamate themselves so quickly with our people as the natives of the Emerald Isle. In some of the visions which have passed through my imagination, I have supposed that Ireland was originally part and parcel of this continent, and that, by some extraordinary convulsion of nature, it was torn from America, and, drifting across the ocean, was placed in the unfortunate vicinity of Great Britain. The same open-heartedness; the same generous hospitality; the same careless and uncalculating indifference about human life, characterize the inhabitants of both countries. Kentucky has been sometimes called the Ireland of America. And I have no doubt that, if the current of emigration were reversed, and set from America upon the shores of Europe, instead of bearing from Europe to America, every American emigrant to Ireland would there find, as every Irish emigrant here finds, a hearty welcome and a happy home!

But I have said that the system nominally called "free trade," so earnestly and eloquently recommended to our adoption, is a mere revival of the British colonial system, forced upon us by Great Britain during the existence of our colonial vassalage. The whole system is fully explained and illustrated in a work published as far back as the year 1750, entitled "The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered," by Joshua Gee, with extracts from which I have been furnished by the diligent researches of a friend. It will be seen from these that the South Carolina policy

now, is identical with the long-cherished policy of Great Britain, which remains the same as it was when the thirteen colonies were part of the British empire.

I regret, Mr. President, that one topic has, I think, unnecessarily been introduced into this debate. I allude to the charge brought against the manufacturing system, as favoring the growth of aristocracy. If it were true, would gentlemen prefer supporting foreign accumulations of wealth, by that description of industry, rather than in their own country? But is it correct? The joint stock companies of the North, as I understand them, are nothing more than associations, sometimes of hundreds, by means of which the small earnings of many are brought into a common stock, and the associates, obtaining corporate privileges, are enabled to prosecute, under one superintending head, their business to better advantage. Nothing can be more essentially democratic, or better devised to counterpoise the influence of individual wealth. In Kentucky, almost every manufactory known to me is in the hands of enterprising and self-made men, who have acquired whatever wealth they possess by patient and diligent labor. Comparisons are odious, and, but in defense, would not be made by me. But is there more tendency to aristocracy in a manufactory, supporting hundreds of freemen, or in a cotton plantation, with its not less numerous slaves, sustaining, perhaps, only two white families—that of the master and the overseer?

I pass, with pleasure, from this disagreeable topic to two general propositions which cover the entire ground of debate. The first is, that under the operation of the American System the objects which it protects and fosters are brought to the consumer at cheaper prices than they commanded prior to its introduction, or than they would command if it did not exist. If that be true, ought not the country to be contented and satisfied with the system, unless the second proposition, which I mean presently also to consider, is unfounded? And that is, that the tendency of the system is to sustain, and that it has upheld the prices of all our agricultural and other produce, including cotton.

And is the fact not indisputable, that all essential objects of consumption affected by the tariff are cheaper and

better since the act of 1824 than they were for several years prior to that law? I appeal for its truth to common observation, and to all practical men. I appeal to the farmer of the country, whether he does not purchase on better terms his iron, salt, brown sugar, cotton goods, and woolens, for his laboring people. And I ask the cotton planter if he has not been better and more cheaply supplied with his cotton bagging. In regard to this latter article, the gentleman from South Carolina was mistaken in supposing that I complained that, under the existing duty, the Kentucky manufacturer could not compete with the Scotch. The Kentuckian furnishes a more substantial and a cheaper article, and at a more uniform and regular price. But it was the frauds, the violations of law, of which I did complain; not smuggling, in the common sense of that practise, which has something bold, daring, and enterprising in it, but mean, barefaced cheating, by fraudulent invoices and false denomination.

I plant myself upon this fact, of cheapness and superiority, as upon impregnable ground. Gentlemen may tax their ingenuity, and produce a thousand speculative solutions of the fact, but the fact itself will remain undisturbed.

This brings me to consider what I apprehend to have been the most efficient of all the causes in the reduction of the prices of manufactured articles—and that is, COMPETITION. By competition the total amount of the supply is increased, and by increase of supply a competition in the sale ensues, and this enables the consumer to buy at lower rates. Of all human powers operating on the affairs of mankind, none is greater than that of competition. It is action and reaction. It operates between individuals in the same nation, and between different nations. It resembles the meeting of the mountain torrent, grooving, by its precipitous motion, its own channel, and ocean's tide. Unopposed, it sweeps everything before it; but, counterpoised, the waters become calm, safe, and regular. It is like the segments of a circle or an arch; taken separately, each is nothing; but in their combination they produce efficiency, symmetry, and perfection. By the American System this vast power has been excited in America, and brought into

being to act in cooperation, or collision, with European industry. Europe acts within itself, and with America; and America acts within itself, and with Europe. The consequence is, the reduction of prices in both hemispheres. Nor is it fair to argue from the reduction of prices in Europe, to her own presumed skill and labor, exclusively. We affect her prices, and she affects ours. This must always be the case, at least in reference to any articles as to which there is not a total non-intercourse; and if our industry, by diminishing the demand for her supplies, should produce a diminution in the price of those supplies, it would be very unfair to ascribe that reduction to her ingenuity, instead of placing it to the credit of our own skill and *excited* industry.

The great law of *price* is determined by supply and demand. Whatever affects either, affects the price. If the supply is increased, the demand remaining the same, the price declines; if the demand is increased, the supply remaining the same, the price advances; if both supply and demand are undiminished, the price is stationary, and the price is influenced exactly in proportion to the degree of disturbance in the demand or supply. It is, therefore, a great error to suppose that an existing or new duty *necessarily* becomes a component element to its exact amount of price. If the proportion of demand and supply are varied by the duty, either in augmenting the supply or diminishing the demand, or vice versa, price is affected to the extent of that variation. But the duty never becomes an integral part of the price, except in the instances where the demand and the supply remain, after the duty is imposed, precisely what they were before, or the demand is increased, and the supply remains stationary.

Competition, therefore, wherever existing, whether at home or abroad, is the parent cause of cheapness. "If a high duty excites production at home, and the quantity of the domestic article exceeds the amount which had been previously imported, the price will fall. This accounts for an extraordinary fact stated by a senator from Missouri. Three cents were laid as a duty upon a pound of lead, by the act of 1828. The price at Galena, and the other lead mines, afterward fell to one and a half cents per pound. Now, it

is obvious that the duty did not, in this case, enter into the price; for it was twice the amount of the price. What produced the fall? It was *stimulated* production at home, excited by the temptation of the exclusive possession of the home market. This state of things could not last. Men would not continue an unprofitable pursuit; some abandoned the business, or the total quantity produced was diminished, and living prices have been the consequence. But, break down the domestic supply, place us again in a state of dependence on the foreign source, and can it be doubted that we should ultimately have to supply ourselves at dearer rates? Is it not fair to credit the foreign market with the depression of prices produced there by the influence of our competition? Let the competition be withdrawn, and their prices would instantly rise.

But it is argued that if, by the skill, experience, and perfection which we have acquired in certain branches of manufacture, they can be made as cheap as similar articles abroad, and enter fairly into competition with them, why not repeal the duties as to those articles? And why should we? Assuming the truth of the supposition, the foreign article would not be introduced in the regular course of trade, but would remain excluded by the possession of the home market which the domestic article had obtained; the repeal, therefore, would have no legitimate effect. But might not the foreign article be imported in vast quantities, to glut our markets, break down our establishments, and ultimately to enable the foreigner to monopolize the supply of our consumption? America is the greatest foreign market for European manufactures. It is that to which European attention is constantly directed. If a great house becomes bankrupt there, its storehouses are emptied, and the goods are shipped to America, where, in consequence of our auctions and our custom-house credits, the greatest facilities are afforded in the sale of them. Combinations among manufacturers might take place, or even the operations of foreign governments might be directed to the destruction of our establishments. A repeal, therefore, of one protecting duty, from some one or all of these causes, would be followed by flooding the country with the foreign fabric, surcharging the market, reducing the price, and a

complete prostration of our manufactories; after which the foreigner would leisurely look about to indemnify himself in the increased prices which he would be enabled to command by his monopoly of the supply of our consumption. What American citizen, after the government had displayed this vacillating policy, would be again tempted to place the smallest confidence in the public faith, and adventure once more in this branch of industry?

Gentlemen have allowed to the manufacturing portions of the community no peace; they have been constantly threatened with the overthrow of the American System. From the year 1820, if not from 1816, down to this time, they have been held in a condition of constant alarm and insecurity. Nothing is more prejudicial to the great interests of a nation than unsettled and varying policy. Although every appeal to the national legislature has been responded to in conformity with the wishes and sentiments of the great majority of the people, measures of protection have only been carried by such small majorities as to excite hopes on the one hand, and fears on the other. Let the country breathe, let its vast resources be developed, let its energies be fully put forth, let it have tranquillity, and, my word for it, the degree of perfection in the arts which it will exhibit will be greater than that which has been presented, astonishing as our progress has been. Although some branches of our manufactures might, and in foreign markets now do, fearlessly contend with similar foreign fabrics, there are many others, yet in their infancy, struggling with difficulties which encompass them. We should look at the whole system, and recollect that time, when we contemplate the great movements of a nation, is very different from the short period which is allotted for the duration of individual life. The honorable gentleman from South Carolina well and eloquently said, in 1824: "No great interest of any country ever yet grew up in a day; no new branch of industry can become firmly and profitably established but in a long course of years; everything, indeed, great or good is matured by slow degrees; that which attains a speedy maturity is of small value, and is destined to a brief existence. It is the order of Providence that powers gradually developed shall alone attain permanency and perfection.

Thus it must be with our national institutions, and national character itself."

I feel most sensibly, Mr. President, how much I have trespassed upon the Senate. My apology is a deep and deliberate conviction that the great cause under debate involves the prosperity and the destiny of the Union. But the best requital I can make for the friendly indulgence which has been extended to me by the Senate, and for which I shall ever retain sentiments of lasting gratitude, is to proceed, with as little delay as practicable, to the conclusion of a discourse which has not been more tedious to the Senate than exhausting to me. I have now to consider the remaining of the two propositions which I have already announced, and which are as follows:

Secondly, that under the operation of the American System the products of our agriculture command a higher price than they would do without it, by the creation of a home market; and by the augmentation of wealth, produced by manufacturing industry, which enlarges our powers of consumption, both of domestic and foreign articles. The importance of the home market is among the established maxims which are universally recognized by all writers and all men. However some may differ as to the relative advantages of the foreign and the home market, none deny to the latter great value and high consideration. It is nearer to us; beyond the control of foreign legislation; and undisturbed by those vicissitudes to which all international intercourse is more or less exposed. The most stupid are sensible of the benefit of a residence in the vicinity of a large manufactory or of a market town, of a good road or of a navigable stream which connects their farms with some great capital. If the pursuits of all men were perfectly the same, although they would be in possession of the greatest abundance of the particular produce of their industry, they might, at the same time, be in extreme want of other necessary articles of human subsistence. The uniformity of the general occupation would preclude all exchanges, all commerce. It is only in the diversity of the vocations of the members of a community that the means can be found for those salutary exchanges which conduce to the general prosperity. And the greater that diversity, the more extensive

and the more animating is the circle of exchange. Even if foreign markets were freely and widely open to the reception of our agricultural produce, from its bulky nature and the distance of the interior and the dangers of the ocean, large portions of it could never profitably reach the foreign market. But let us quit this field of theory, clear as it is, and look at the practical operation of the system of protection, beginning with the most valuable staple of our agriculture.

But if all this reasoning were totally fallacious—if the price of manufactured articles were really higher, under the American System, than without it, I should still argue that, high or low, prices were themselves relative—relative to the ability to pay them. It is in vain to tempt, to tantalize us with the lower prices of European fabrics than our own, if we have nothing wherewith to purchase them. If, by the home exchanges, we can be supplied with necessary—even if they are dearer and worse—articles of American production than the foreign, it is better than not to be supplied at all. And how would the large portion of our country which I have described be supplied but for the home exchanges? A poor people, destitute of wealth or of exchangeable goods has nothing with which to purchase foreign fabrics. To them they are equally beyond their reach, whether their cost be a dollar or a guinea. It is in this view of the matter that Great Britain, by her vast wealth—her *excited and protected* industry—is enabled to bear a burden of taxation which, when compared to that of other nations, appears enormous; but which, when her immense riches are compared to theirs, is light and trivial. The gentleman from South Carolina has drawn a lively and flattering picture of our coasts, bays, rivers, and harbors; and he argues that these proclaimed the design of Providence that we should be a commercial people. I agree with him. We differ only as to the means. He would cherish the foreign, and neglect the internal trade. I would foster both. What is navigation without ships, or ships without cargoes? By penetrating the bosoms of our mountains, and extracting from them their precious treasures; by cultivating the earth, and *securing* a home market for its rich and abundant products; by employing the water power with which we are blessed; by stimulating and pro-

tecting our native industry, in all its forms, we shall but nourish and promote the prosperity of commerce, foreign and domestic.

I have hitherto considered the question in reference only to a state of peace; but a season of war ought not to be entirely overlooked. We have enjoyed near twenty years of peace; but who can tell when the storm of war shall again break forth? Have we forgotten, so soon, the privations to which, not merely our brave soldiers and our gallant tars were subjected, but the whole community, during the last war, for the want of absolute necessaries? To what an enormous price they rose! And how inadequate the supply was, at any price! The statesman who justly elevates his views will look behind, as well as forward, and at the existing state of things; and he will graduate the policy which he recommends to all the probable exigencies which may arise in the Republic. Taking this comprehensive range, it would be easy to show that the higher prices of peace, if prices were higher in peace, were more than compensated by the lower prices of war, during which supplies of all essential articles are indispensable to its vigorous, effectual, and glorious prosecution. I conclude this part of the argument with the hope that my humble exertions have not been altogether unsuccessful in showing:—

1. That the policy which we have been considering ought to continue to be regarded as the genuine American System.

2. That the Free Trade System, which is proposed as its substitute, ought really to be considered as the British Colonial System.

3. That the American System is beneficial to all parts of the Union, and absolutely necessary to much the larger portion.

4. That the price of the great staple of cotton, and of all our chief productions of agriculture, has been sustained and upheld, and a decline averted, by the Protective System.

5. That if the foreign demand for cotton has been at all diminished by the operation of that system, the diminution has been more than compensated in the additional demand created at home.

6. That the constant tendency of the system, by creat-

ing competition among ourselves, and between American and European industry, reciprocally acting upon each other, is to reduce prices of manufactured objects.

7. That, in point of fact, objects within the scope of the policy of protection have greatly fallen in price.

8. That if, in a season of peace, these benefits are experienced, in a season of war, when the foreign supply might be cut off, they would be much more extensively felt.

And, finally, that the substitution of the British Colonial System for the American System, without benefiting any section of the Union, by subjecting us to a foreign legislation, regulated by foreign interests, would lead to the prostration of our manufactures, general impoverishment, and ultimate ruin.

The danger to our Union does not lie on the side of persistence in the American System, but on that of its abandonment. If, as I have supposed and believe, the inhabitants of all north and east of the James River, and all west of the mountains, including Louisiana, are deeply interested in the preservation of that system, would they be reconciled to its overthrow? Can it be expected that two-thirds, if not three-fourths, of the people of the United States, would consent to the destruction of a policy believed to be indispensably necessary to their prosperity — when, too, the sacrifice is made at the instance of a single interest, which they verily believe will not be promoted by it? In estimating the degree of peril which may be incident to two opposite courses of human policy, the statesman would be short-sighted who would content himself with viewing only the evils, real or imaginary, which belong to that course which is in practical operation. He should lift himself up to the contemplation of those greater and more certain dangers which might inevitably attend the adoption of the alternative course. What would be the condition of this Union if Pennsylvania and New York, those mammoth members of our confederacy, were firmly persuaded that their industry was paralyzed, and their prosperity blighted, by the enforcement of the British colonial system, under the delusive name of free trade? They are now tranquil and happy and contented, conscious of their welfare, and

feeling a salutary and rapid circulation of the products of home manufactures and home industry throughout all their great arteries. But let that be checked, let them feel that a foreign system is to predominate, and the sources of their subsistence and comfort dried up; let New England, and the West, and the Middle States, all feel that they, too, are the victims of a mistaken policy, and let these vast portions of our country despair of any favorable change, and then, indeed, we might tremble for the continuance and safety of this Union!

And now, sir, I would address a few words to the friends of the American System in the Senate. The revenue must —ought to be reduced. The country will not, after, by the payment of the public debt, ten or twelve millions of dollars become unnecessary, bear such an annual surplus. Its distribution would form a subject of perpetual contention. Some of the opponents of the system understand the stratagem by which to attack it, and are shaping their course accordingly. It is to crush the system by the accumulation of revenue, and by the effort to persuade the people that they are unnecessarily taxed, while those would really tax them who would break up the native sources of supply, and render them dependent upon the foreign. But the revenue ought to be reduced, so as to accommodate it to the fact of the payment of the public debt. And the alternative is, or may be, to preserve the protecting system, and repeal the duties on the unprotected articles, or to *preserve* the duties on *unprotected* articles, and endanger, if not destroy, the system. Let us, then, adopt the measure before us, which will benefit all classes: the farmer, the professional man, the merchant, the manufacturer, the mechanic, and the cotton planter more than all. A few months ago there was no diversity of opinion as to the expediency of this measure. All then seemed to unite in the selection of these objects for a repeal of duties which were not produced within the country. Such a repeal did not touch our domestic industry, violated no principle, offended no prejudice.

Can we not all, whatever may be our favorite theories, cordially unite on this neutral ground? When that is occupied, let us look beyond it, and see if anything can be done in the field of protection to modify or improve it, or to

satisfy those who are opposed to the system. Our Southern brethren believe that it is injurious to them, and ask its repeal. We believe that its abandonment will be prejudicial to them, and ruinous to every other section of the Union. However strong their convictions may be, they are not stronger than ours. Between the points of the preservation of the system and its absolute repeal there is no principle of union. If it can be shown to operate immoderately on any quarter—if the measure of protection to any article can be demonstrated to be undue and inordinate, it would be the duty of Congress to interpose and apply a remedy. And none will cooperate more heartily than I shall in the performance of that duty. It is quite probable that beneficial modifications of the system may be made, without impairing its efficacy. But, to make it fulfil the purposes of its institution, the measure of protection ought to be adequate. If it be not, all interests will be injuriously affected. The manufacturer, crippled in his exertions, will produce less perfect and dearer fabrics, and the consumer will feel the consequence. This is the spirit, and these are the principles only, on which, it seems to me, that a complete settlement of the great question can be made, satisfactorily, to all parts of our great Union.

ON THE COMPROMISE OF 1850

Mr. President: In the progress of this debate it has been again and again argued that perfect tranquillity reigns throughout the country, and that there is no disturbance threatening its peace, endangering its safety, but that which was produced by busy, restless politicians. It has been maintained that the surface of the public mind is perfectly smooth and undisturbed by a single billow. I most heartily wish I could concur in this picture of general tranquillity that has been drawn upon both sides of the Senate. I am no alarmist; nor, I thank God, at the advanced age at which His providence has been pleased to allow me to reach, am I very easily alarmed by any human event; but I totally misread the signs of the times, if there be that state of profound peace and quiet, that absence of all just cause of

apprehension of future danger to this confederacy, which appears to be entertained by some other senators. Mr. President, all the tendencies of the times, I lament to say, are toward disquietude, if not more fatal consequences. When before, in the midst of profound peace and with all the nations of the earth, have we seen a convention, representing a considerable portion of one great part of the Republic, meet to deliberate about measures of future safety in connection with great interests of that quarter of the country? When before have we seen, not one, but more, some half a dozen, legislative bodies solemnly resolving that if any one of these measures—the admission of California, the adoption of the Wilmot proviso, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia—should be adopted by Congress, measures of an extreme character, for the safety of the great interests to which I refer, in a particular section of the country, would be resorted to? For years this subject of the abolition of slavery, even within this District of Columbia, small as is the number of slaves here, has been a source of constant irritation and disquiet. So of the subject of the recovery of fugitive slaves who have escaped from their lawful owners: not a mere border contest, as has been supposed—although there, undoubtedly, it has given rise to more irritation than in other portions of the Union—but everywhere throughout the slaveholding country it has been felt as a great evil, a great wrong which required the intervention of congressional power. But these two subjects, unpleasant as has been the agitation to which they have given rise, are nothing in comparison to those which have sprung out of the acquisitions recently made from the republic of Mexico. These are not only great and leading causes of just apprehension as respects the future, but all the minor circumstances of the day intimate danger ahead, whatever may be its final issue and consequence.

Mr. President, I will not dwell upon other concomitant causes, all having the same tendency, and all well calculated to awaken, to arouse us—if, as I hope the fact is, we are all of us sincerely desirous of preserving this Union—to rouse us to dangers which really exist, without underrating them upon the one hand or magnifying them upon the other.

It has been objected against this measure that it is a compromise. It has been said that it is a compromise of principle, or of a principle. Mr. President, what is a compromise? It is a work of mutual concession—an agreement in which there are reciprocal stipulations—a work in which, for the sake of peace and concord, one party abates his extreme demands in consideration of an abatement of extreme demands by the other party: it is a measure of mutual concession—a measure of mutual sacrifice. Undoubtedly, Mr. President, in all such measures of compromise, one party would be very glad to get what he wants, and reject what he does not desire but which the other party wants. But when he comes to reflect that, from the nature of the government and its operations, and from those with whom he is dealing, it is necessary upon his part, in order to secure what he wants, to grant something to the other side, he should be reconciled to the concession which he has made in consequence of the concession which he is to receive, if there is no great principle involved, such as a violation of the Constitution of the United States. I admit that such a compromise as that ought never to be sanctioned or adopted. But I now call upon any senator in his place to point out from the beginning to the end, from California to New Mexico, a solitary provision in this bill which is violative of the Constitution of the United States.

Sir, adjustments in the shape of compromise may be made without producing any such consequences as have been apprehended. There may be a mutual forbearance. You forbear on your side to insist upon the application of the restriction denominated the Wilmot proviso. Is there any violation of principle there? The most that can be said, even assuming the power to pass the Wilmot proviso, which is denied, is that there is a forbearance to exercise, not a violation of, the power to pass the proviso. So, upon the other hand, if there was a power in the Constitution of the United States authorizing the establishment of slavery in any of the territories—a power, however, which is controverted by a large portion of this Senate—if there was a power under the Constitution to establish slavery, the forbearance to exercise that power is no violation of the Constitution, any more than the Constitution is violated by

a forbearance to exercise numerous powers, that might be specified, that are granted in the Constitution, and that remain dormant until they come to be exercised by the proper legislative authorities. It is said that the bill presents the state of coercion—that members are coerced, in order to get what they want, to vote for that which they disapprove. Why, sir, what coercion is there? Can it be said upon the part of our Northern friends, because they have not got the Wilmot proviso incorporated in the territorial part of the bill, that they are coerced—wanting California, as they do, so much—to vote for the bill, if they do vote for it? Sir, they might have imitated the noble example of my friend [Senator Cooper, of Pennsylvania] from that state upon whose devotion to this Union I place one of my greatest reliances for its preservation. What was the course of my friend upon this subject of the Wilmot proviso? He voted for it; and he could go back to his constituents and say, as all of you could go back and say to your constituents, if you chose to do so: "We wanted the Wilmot proviso in the bill; we tried to get it in; but the majority of the Senate was against it." The question then came up whether we should lose California, which has got an interdiction in her constitution which, in point of value and duration, is worth a thousand Wilmot provisoes; we were induced, as my honorable friend might say, to take the bill and the whole of it together, although we were disappointed in our votes with respect to the Wilmot proviso—to take it, whatever omissions may have been made, on account of the superior amount of good it contains.

Not the reception of the treaty of peace negotiated at Ghent, nor any other event which has occurred during my progress in public life, ever gave such unbounded and universal satisfaction as the settlement of the Missouri compromise. We may argue from like causes like effects. Then, indeed, there was great excitement. Then, indeed, all the legislatures of the North called out for the exclusion of Missouri, and all the legislatures of the South called out for her admission as a state. Then, as now, the country was agitated like the ocean in the midst of a turbulent storm. But now, more than then, has this agitation been increased. Now, more than then, are the dangers which

exist, if the controversy remains unsettled, more aggravated and more to be dreaded. The idea of disunion was then scarcely a low whisper. Now, it has become a familiar language in certain portions of the country. The public mind and the public heart are becoming familiarized with that most dangerous and fatal of all events—the disunion of the states. People begin to contend that this is not so bad a thing as they had supposed. Like the progress in all human affairs, as we approach danger it disappears, it diminishes in our conception, and we no longer regard it with that awful apprehension of consequences that we did before we came into contact with it. Everywhere now there is a state of things, a degree of alarm and apprehension, and determination to fight, as they regard it, against the aggressions of the North. That did not so demonstrate itself at the period of the Missouri compromise. It was followed, in consequence of the adoption of the measure which settled the difficulty of Missouri, by peace, harmony, and tranquillity. So now I infer, from the greater amount of agitation, from the greater amount of danger, that, if you adopt the measures under consideration, they, too, will be followed by the same amount of contentment, satisfaction, peace, and tranquillity which ensued after the Missouri compromise.

The responsibility of this great measure passes from the hands of the committee, and from my hands. They know, and I know, that it is an awful and tremendous responsibility. I hope that you will meet it with a just conception and a true appreciation of its magnitude, and the magnitude of the consequences that may ensue from your decision one way or the other. The alternatives, I fear, which the measure presents, are concord and increased discord; a servile civil war, originating in its causes on the lower Rio Grande, and terminating possibly in its consequences on the upper Rio Grande in the Santa Fé country, or the restoration of harmony and fraternal kindness. I believe from the bottom of my soul that the measure is the reunion of this Union. I believe it is the dove of peace, which, taking its aerial flight from the dome of the capitol, carries the glad tidings of assured peace and restored harmony to all the remotest extremities of this distracted land. I believe

that it will be attended with all these beneficent effects. And now let us discard all resentment, all passions, all petty jealousies, all personal desires, all love of place, all hankerings after the gilded crumbs which fall from the table of power. Let us forget popular fears, from whatever quarter they may spring. Let us go to the limpid fountain of unadulterated patriotism, and, performing a solemn lustration, return divested of all selfish, sinister, and sordid impurities, and think alone of our God, our country, our consciences, and our glorious Union—that Union without which we shall be torn into hostile fragments, and sooner or later become the victims of military despotism or foreign domination.

Mr. President, what is an individual man? An atom, almost invisible without a magnifying glass—a mere speck upon the surface of the immense universe; not a second in time, compared to immeasurable, never-beginning, and never-ending eternity; a drop of water in the great deep, which evaporates and is borne off by the winds; a grain of sand, which is soon gathered to the dust from which it sprung. Shall a being so small, so petty, so fleeting, so evanescent, oppose itself to the onward march of a great nation which is to subsist for ages and ages to come; oppose itself to that long line of posterity which, issuing from our loins, will endure during the existence of the world? Forbid it, God. Let us look to our country and our cause, elevate ourselves to the dignity of pure and disinterested patriots, and save our country from all impending dangers. What if, in the march of this nation to greatness and power, we should be buried beneath the wheels that propel it onward! What are we—what is any man—worth who is not ready and willing to sacrifice himself for the benefit of his country when it is necessary?

If this Union shall become separated, new unions, new confederacies, will arise. And with respect to this, if there be any—I hope there is no one in the Senate—before whose imagination is flitting the idea of a great Southern confederacy to take possession of the Balize and the mouth of the Mississippi, I say in my place never—*never*—NEVER will we who occupy the broad waters of the Mississippi and its upper tributaries consent that any foreign flag shall float at

the Balize or upon the turrets of the Crescent City—NEVER! NEVER! I call upon all the South. Sir, we have had hard words, bitter words, bitter thoughts, unpleasant feelings toward each other in the progress of this great measure. Let us forget them. Let us sacrifice these feelings. Let us go to the altar of our country and swear, as the oath was taken of old, that we will stand by her; that we will support her; that we will uphold her Constitution; that we will preserve her union; and that we will pass this great, comprehensive, and healing system of measures, which will hush all the jarring elements and bring peace and tranquillity to our homes.

Let me, Mr. President, in conclusion, say that the most disastrous consequences would occur, in my opinion, were we to go home, doing nothing to satisfy and tranquillize the country upon these great questions. What will be the judgment of mankind, what the judgment of that portion of mankind who are looking upon the progress of this scheme of self-government as being that which holds the highest hopes and expectations of ameliorating the condition of mankind—what will their judgment be? Will not all the monarchs of the Old World pronounce our glorious republic a disgraceful failure? What will be the judgment of our constituents, when we return to them and they ask us: "How have you left your country? Is all quiet—all happy? Are all the seeds of distraction or division crushed and dissipated?" And, sir, when you come into the bosom of your family, when you come to converse with the partner of your fortunes, of your happiness, and of your sorrows, and when in the midst of the common offspring of both of you, she asks you: "Is there any danger of civil war? Is there any danger of the torch being applied to any portion of the country? Have you settled the questions which you have been so long discussing and deliberating upon at Washington? Is all peace and all quiet?" what response, Mr. President, can you make to that wife of your choice and those children with whom you have been blessed by God? Will you go home and leave all in disorder and confusion —all unsettled—all open? The contentions and agitations of the past will be increased and augmented by the agitations resulting from our neglect to decide them. Sir, we

shall stand condemned by all human judgment below, and of that above it is not for me to speak. We shall stand condemned in our own consciences, by our own constituents, and by our own country. The measure may be defeated. I have been aware that its passage for many days was not absolutely certain. From the first to the last, I hoped and believed it would pass, because from the first to the last I believed it was founded on the principles of just and righteous concession, of mutual conciliation. I believe that it deals unjustly by no part of the Republic; that it saves their honor, and, as far as it is dependent upon Congress, saves the interests of all quarters of the country. But, sir, I have known that the decision of its fate depended upon four or five votes in the Senate of the United States, whose ultimate judgment we could not count upon the one side or the other with absolute certainty. Its fate is now committed to the Senate, and to those five or six votes to which I have referred. It may be defeated. It is possible that, for the chastisement of our sins and transgressions, the rod of Providence may be still applied to us, may be still suspended over us. But, if defeated, it will be a triumph of ultraism and impracticability—a triumph of a most extraordinary conjunction of extremes; a victory won by abolitionism; a victory achieved by free-soilism; a victory of discord and agitation over peace and tranquillity; and I pray to Almighty God that it may not, in consequence of the inauspicious result, lead to the most unhappy and disastrous consequences to our beloved country.

Mr. Barnwell—It is not my intention to reply to the argument of the senator from Kentucky, but there were expressions used by him not a little disrespectful to a friend whom I hold very dear. It is true that his political opinions differ very widely from those of the senator from Kentucky. It may be true that he, with many great statesmen, may believe that the Wilmot proviso is a grievance to be resisted "to the utmost extremity" by those whose rights it destroys and whose honor it degrades. It is true that he may believe . . . that the admission of California will be the passing of the Wilmot proviso, when we here in Congress give vitality to an act otherwise totally dead, and by our legislation exclude slaveholders from that whole broad territory

on the Pacific; and, entertaining this opinion, he may have declared that the contingency will then have occurred which will, in the judgment of most of the slaveholding states, as expressed by their resolutions, justify resistance as to an intolerable aggression. If he does entertain and has expressed such sentiments, he is not to be held up as peculiarly a disunionist. Allow me to say, in reference to this matter, I regret that you have brought it about, but it is true that this epithet "disunionist" is likely soon to have very little terror in it in the South. Words do not make things. "Rebel" was designed as a very odious term when applied by those who would have trampled on the rights of our ancestors, but I believe that the expression became not an ungrateful one to the ears of those who resisted them. It was not the lowest term of abuse to call those who were conscious that they were struggling against oppression; and let me assure gentlemen that the term disunionist is rapidly assuming at the South the meaning which rebel took when it was baptized in the blood of Warren at Bunker Hill, and illustrated by the gallantry of Jasper at Fort Moultrie.

Mr. Clay—Mr. President, I said nothing with respect to the character of Mr. Rhett, for I might as well name him. I know him personally, and have some respect for him. But if he pronounced the sentiment attributed to him, of raising the standard of disunion and of resistance to the common government, whatever he has been, if he follows up that declaration by corresponding overt acts, he will be a *traitor*, and I hope he will meet the fate of a traitor.

The President—The Chair will be under the necessity of ordering the gallery to be cleared if there is again the slightest interruption. He has once already given warning that he is under the necessity of keeping order. The Senate chamber is not a theater.

Mr. Clay—Mr. President, I have heard with pain and regret a confirmation of the remark I made, that the sentiment of disunion is becoming familiar. I hope it is confined to South Carolina. I do not regard as my duty what the honorable senator seems to regard as his. If Kentucky to-morrow unfurls the banner of resistance unjustly, I never will fight under that banner. I owe a paramount allegiance to the whole Union—a subordinate one to my own state.

When my state is right—when it has a cause for resistance —when tyranny, and wrong, and oppression insufferable arise, I will then share her fortunes; but if she summons me to the battle-field, or to support her in any cause which is unjust, against the Union, never, *never* will I engage with her in such cause.

ON THE SEMINOLE WAR

If my recollection does not deceive me, Bonaparte had passed the Rhine and the Alps, had conquered Italy, the Netherlands, Holland, Hanover, Lübeck, and Hamburg, and extended his empire as far as Altona, on the side of Denmark. A few days' march would have carried him through Holstein, over the two Belts, through Fünen, and into the island of Zealand. What, then, was the conduct of England? It was my lot to fall into conversation with an intelligent Englishman on this subject. "We knew (said he) that we were fighting for our existence. It was absolutely necessary that we should preserve the command of the seas. If the fleet of Denmark fell into the enemy's hands, combined with his other fleets, that command might be rendered doubtful. Denmark had only a nominal independence. She was, in truth, subject to his sway. We said to her: 'Give us your fleet; it will otherwise be taken possession of by your secret and our open enemy. We will preserve it and restore it to you whenever the danger shall be over.' Denmark refused. Copenhagen was bombarded, and gallantly defended, but the fleet was seized." Everywhere the conduct of England was censured; and the name even of the negotiator who was employed by her, who was subsequently the minister near this government, was scarcely ever pronounced here without coupling with it an epithet indicating his participation in the disgraceful transaction. And yet we are going to sanction acts of violence, committed by ourselves, which but too much resemble it! What an important difference, too, between the relative condition of England and of this country! She, perhaps, was struggling for her existence. She was combating,

single-handed, the most enormous military power that the world has ever known. With whom were we contending? With a few half-starved, half-clothed, wretched Indians and fugitive slaves. And while carrying on this inglorious war, inglorious as regards the laurels or renown won in it, we violate neutral rights which the government had solemnly pledged itself to respect, upon the principle of convenience, or upon the light presumption that, by possibility, a post might be taken by this miserable combination of Indians and slaves. . . .

I will not trespass much longer upon the time of the committee; but I trust I shall be indulged with some few reflections upon the danger of permitting the conduct on which it has been my painful duty to animadvert, to pass without the solemn expression of the disapprobation of this house. Recall to your recollection the free nations which have gone before us. Where are they now?

> "Gone glimmering through the dream of things that were,
> A schoolboy's tale, the wonder of an hour."

And how have they lost their liberties? If we could transport ourselves back to the ages when Greece and Rome flourished in their greatest prosperity, and, mingling in the throng, should ask a Grecian if he did not fear that some daring military chieftain, covered with glory, some Philip or Alexander, would one day overthrow the liberties of his country, the confident and indignant Grecian would exclaim, "No! no: we have nothing to fear from our heroes; our liberties will be eternal." If a Roman citizen had been asked if he did not fear that the conqueror of Gaul might establish a throne upon the ruins of public liberty, he would have instantly repelled the unjust insinuation. Yet Greece fell; Cæsar passed the Rubicon, and the patriotic arm even of Brutus could not preserve the liberties of his devoted country! The celebrated Madame de Staël, in her last and perhaps her best work, has said that in the very year, almost the very month, when the president of the Directory declared that monarchy would never more show its frightful head in France, Bonaparte, with his grenadiers, entered the palace of St. Cloud, and, dispersing with the bayonet the deputies of the people deliberating on the affairs of the

state, laid the foundation of that vast fabric of despotism which overshadowed all Europe. I hope not to be misunderstood; I am far from intimating that General Jackson cherishes any designs inimical to the liberties of the country. I believe his intentions to be pure and patriotic. I thank God that he would not, but I thank Him still more that he could not if he would, overturn the liberties of the Republic. But precedents, if bad, are fraught with the most dangerous consequences. Man has been described, by some of those who have treated of his nature, as a bundle of habits. The definition is much truer when applied to governments. Precedents are their habits. There is one important difference between the formation of habits by an individual and by governments. He contracts only after frequent repetition. A single instance fixes the habit and determines the direction of governments. Against the alarming doctrine of unlimited discretion in our military commanders when applied even to prisoners of war, I must enter my protest. It begins upon them; it will end on us. I hope our happy form of government is to be perpetual. But if it is to be preserved, it must be by the practise of virtue, by justice, by moderation, by magnanimity, by greatness of soul, by keeping a watchful and steady eye on the executive; and, above all, by holding to a strict accountability the military branch of the public force.

We are fighting a great moral battle for the benefit, not only of our country, but of all mankind. The eyes of the whole world are in fixed attention upon us. One, and the larger portion of it, is gazing with contempt, with jealousy, and with envy; the other portion, with hope, with confidence, and with affection. Everywhere the black cloud of legitimacy is suspended over the world, save only one bright spot, which breaks out from the political hemisphere of the West, to enlighten and animate and gladden the human heart. Obscure that by the downfall of liberty here, and all mankind is enshrouded in a pall of universal darkness. To you, Mr. Chairman, belongs the high privilege of transmitting, unimpaired, to posterity the fair character and liberty of our country. Do you expect to execute this high trust by trampling, or suffering to be trampled down, law, justice, the Constitution, and the rights of the people? by

exhibiting examples of inhumanity and cruelty and ambition? When the minions of despotism heard, in Europe, of the seizure of Pensacola, how did they chuckle, and chide the admirers of our institutions, tauntingly pointing to the demonstration of a spirit of injustice and aggrandizement made by our country, in the midst of an amicable negotiation! Behold, said they, the conduct of those who are constantly reproaching kings! You saw how those admirers were astounded and hung their heads. You saw, too, when that illustrious man who presides over us adopted his pacific, moderate, and just course, how they once more lifted up their heads with exultation and delight beaming in their countenances. And you saw how those minions themselves were finally compelled to unite in the general praises bestowed upon our government. Beware how you forfeit this exalted character. Beware how you give a fatal sanction, in this infant period of our republic, scarcely yet twoscore years old, to military insubordination. Remember that Greece had her Alexander, Rome her Cæsar, England her Cromwell, France her Bonaparte, and that if we would escape the rock on which they split we must avoid their errors.

How different has been the treatment of General Jackson and that modest but heroic young man, a native of one of the smallest states in the Union, who achieved for his country, on Lake Erie, one of the most glorious victories of the late war. In a moment of passion he forgot himself and offered an act of violence which was repented of as soon as perpetrated. He was tried, and suffered the judgment to be pronounced by his peers. Public justice was thought not even then to be satisfied. The press and Congress took up the subject. My honorable friend from Virginia [Mr. Johnson], the faithful and consistent sentinel of the law and of the Constitution, disapproved in that instance, as he does in this, and moved an inquiry. The public mind remained agitated and unappeased until the recent atonement, so honorably made by the gallant commodore. And is there to be a distinction between the officers of the two branches of the public service? Are former services, however eminent, to preclude even inquiry into recent misconduct? Is there to be no limit, no pru-

dential bounds to the national gratitude? I am not disposed to censure the President for not ordering a court of inquiry, or a general court-martial. Perhaps, impelled by a sense of gratitude, he determined, by anticipation, to extend to the general that pardon which he had the undoubted right to grant after sentence. Let us not shrink from our duty. Let us assert our constitutional powers, and vindicate the instrument from military violation.

I hope gentlemen will deliberately survey the awful isthmus on which we stand. They may bear down all opposition; they may even vote the general the public thanks; they may carry him triumphantly through this house. But if they do, in my humble judgment it will be a triumph of the principle of insubordination, a triumph of the military over the civil authority, a triumph over the powers of this house, a triumph over the Constitution of the land. And I pray most devoutly to Heaven that it may not prove, in its ultimate effects and consequences, a triumph over the liberties of the people.

THE EMANCIPATION OF SOUTH AMERICA

I rise under feelings of deeper regret than I have ever experienced on any former occasion, inspired principally by the consideration that I find myself, on the proposition which I meant to submit, differing from many highly esteemed friends, in and out of this house, for whose judgment I entertained the greatest respect. A knowledge of this circumstance has induced me to pause; to subject my own convictions to the severest scrutiny, and to revolve the question over and over again. But all my reflections have conducted me to the same clear result; and, much as I value those friends, great as my deference is for their opinions, I cannot hesitate when reduced to the distressing alternative of conforming my judgment to theirs or pursuing the deliberate and mature dictates of my own mind. I enjoy some consolation for the want of their cooperation from the persuasion that, if I err on this occasion, I err on the side of the liberty and happiness of a large portion of

the human family. Another and, if possible, indeed a greater source of the regret to which I refer is the utter incompetency which I unfeignedly feel to do anything like adequate justice to the great cause of American independence and freedom, whose interests I wish to promote by my humble exertions in this instance. Exhausted and worn down as I am, by the fatigue, confinement, and incessant application incident to the arduous duties of the honorable station I hold, during a four-months' session, I shall need all that kind indulgence which has been so often extended to me by the House.

I beg, in the first place, to correct misconceptions, if any exist, in regard to my opinions. I am averse to war with Spain, or with any power. I would give no just cause of war to any power—not to Spain herself. I have seen enough of war, and of its calamities, even when successful. No country on earth has more interest than this in cultivating peace and avoiding war, as long as it is possible honorably to avoid it. Gaining additional strength every day; our numbers doubling in periods of twenty-five years; with an income outstripping all our estimates, and so great as, after a war in some respects disastrous, to furnish results which carry astonishment, if not dismay, into the bosom of states jealous of our rising importance, we have every motive for the love of peace. I cannot, however, approve in all respects of the manner in which our negotiations with Spain have been conducted. If ever a favorable time existed for the demand, on the part of an injured nation, of indemnity for past wrongs from the aggressor, such is the present time. Impoverished and exhausted at home, by the wars which have desolated the Peninsula; with a foreign war, calling for infinitely more resources, in men and money, than she can possibly command—this is the auspicious period for insisting upon justice at her hands in a firm and decided tone. Time is precisely what Spain now wants. Yet what are we told by the President, in his message at the commencement of Congress? That Spain has procrastinated, and we acquiesced in her procrastination. And the secretary of state, in a late communication with Mr. Onis, after ably vindicating all our rights, tells the Spanish minister, with a good deal of sang-froid, that

we had patiently waited thirteen years for a redress of our injuries, and that it required no great effort to wait longer. I would have abstained from thus exposing our intentions. Avoiding the use of the language of menace, I would have required, in temperate and decided terms, indemnity for all our wrongs: for the spoliations of our commerce; for the interruption to the right of depot at New Orleans, guaranteed by treaty; for the insults repeatedly offered to our flag; for the Indian hostilities which she was bound to prevent; for belligerent use of her ports and territories by our enemy during the late war; and the instantaneous liberation of the free citizens of the United States, now imprisoned in her jails. Contemporaneously with that demand, without waiting for her final answer, and with a view to the favorable operation on her councils in regard to our own peculiar interests, as well as in justice to the cause itself, I would recognize any established government in Spanish America. I would have left Spain to draw her own inferences from these proceedings as to the ultimate step which this country might adopt if she longer withheld justice from us. And if she persevered in her iniquity after we had conducted the negotiations in the manner I have endeavored to describe, I would then take up and decide the solemn question of peace or war, with the advantage of all the light shed upon it by subsequent events and the probable conduct of Europe.

Spain has undoubtedly given us abundant and just cause for war. But it is not every cause of war that should lead to war. War is one of those dreadful scourges that so shakes the foundation of society, overturns or changes the character of government, interrupts or destroys the pursuits of private happiness, brings, in short, misery and wretchedness in so many forms, and at last is, in its issue, so doubtful and hazardous, that nothing but dire necessity can justify an appeal to arms. If we are to have war with Spain, I have, however, no hesitation in saying that no mode of bringing it about could be less fortunate than that of seizing, at this time, upon her adjoining province. There was a time, under certain circumstances, when we might have occupied East Florida with safety; had we then taken it, our posture in the negotiation with Spain would have

been totally different from what it is. But we have permitted that time, not with my consent, to pass by unimproved. If we were now to seize upon Florida, after a great change in those circumstances, and after declaring our intention to acquiesce in the procrastination desired by Spain, in what light should we be viewed by foreign powers, particularly Great Britain? We have already been accused of inordinate ambition, and of seeking to aggrandize ourselves by an extension, on all sides, of our limits. Should we not, by such an act of violence, give color to the accusation? No, Mr. Chairman, if we are to be involved in a war with Spain, let us have the credit of disinterestedness. Let us put her yet more in the wrong. Let us command the respect which is never withheld from those who act a noble and generous part. I hope to communicate to the committee the conviction which I so strongly feel, that the adoption of the amendment which I intend to propose would not hazard in the slightest degree the peace of the country. But if that peace is to be endangered, I would infinitely rather it should be for our exerting the right appertaining to every state, of acknowledging the independence of another state, than for the seizure of a province which sooner or later we must acquire.

In contemplating the great struggle in which Spanish America is now engaged, our attention is fixed first by the immensity and character of the country which Spain seeks again to subjugate. Stretching on the Pacific Ocean from about the fortieth degree of north latitude to about the fifty-fifth degree of south latitude, and extending from the mouth of the Rio del Norte (exclusive of East Florida) around the Gulf of Mexico and along the South Atlantic to near Cape Horn, it is about five thousand miles in length, and in some places nearly three thousand in breadth. Within this vast region we behold the most sublime and interesting objects of creation, the richest mines of the precious metals, and the choicest productions of the earth. We behold there a spectacle still more interesting and sublime—the glorious spectacle of eighteen millions of people struggling to burst their chains and to be free. When we take a little nearer and more detailed view, we perceive that nature has, as it were, ordained that this people and this

country shall ultimately constitute several different nations. Leaving the United States on the north, we come to New Spain or the viceroyalty of Mexico on the south; passing by Guatemala, we reach the viceroyalty of New Granada, the late captain-generalship of Venezuela, and Guiana, lying on the east side of the Andes. Stepping over the Brazils, we arrive at the united provinces of La Plata, and crossing the Andes we find Chile on their west side, and farther north the viceroyalty of Lima, or Peru. Each of these several parts is sufficient in itself in point of limits to constitute a powerful state; and in point of population, that which has the smallest contains enough to make it respectable. Throughout all the extent of that great portion of the world which I have attempted thus hastily to describe, the spirit of revolt against the dominion of Spain has manifested itself. The revolution has been attended with various degrees of success in the several parts of Spanish America. In some it has been already crowned, as I shall endeavor to show, with complete success, and in all I am persuaded that independence has struck such deep root that the power of Spain can never eradicate it. What are the causes of this great movement?

Three hundred years ago, upon the ruins of the thrones of Montezuma and the Incas of Peru, Spain erected the most stupendous system of colonial despotism that the world has ever seen—the most vigorous, the most exclusive. The great principle and object of this system have been to render one of the largest portions of the world exclusively subservient, in all its faculties, to the interests of an inconsiderable spot in Europe To effectuate this aim of her policy, she locked up Spanish America from all the rest of the world, and prohibited, under the severest penalties, any foreigner from entering any part of it. To keep the natives themselves ignorant of each other, and of the strength and resources of the several parts of her American possessions, she next prohibited the inhabitants of one viceroyalty or government from visiting those of another; so that the inhabitants of Mexico, for example, were not allowed to enter the viceroyalty of New Granada. The agriculture of those vast regions was so regulated and restrained as to prevent all collision with the agriculture of

the Peninsula. Where nature, by the character and composition of the soil, has commanded, the abominable system of Spain has forbidden, the growth of certain articles. Thus the olive and the vine, to which Spanish America is so well adapted, are prohibited wherever their culture can interfere with the olive and the vine of the Peninsula. The commerce of the country, in the direction and objects of the exports and imports, is also subjected to the narrow and selfish views of Spain, and fettered by the odious spirit of monopoly existing in Cadiz. She has sought, by scattering discord among the several castes of her American population and by a debasing course of education, to perpetuate her oppression. Whatever concerns public law or the science of government, all writings upon political economy or that tend to give vigor and freedom and expansion to the intellect, are prohibited. Gentlemen would be astonished by the long list of distinguished authors, whom she proscribes, to be found in Depons and other works. A main feature in her policy is that which constantly elevates the European and depresses the American character. Out of upward of seven hundred and fifty viceroys and captains-general whom she has appointed since the conquest of America, about eighteen only have been from the body of her American population. On all occasions, she seeks to raise and promote her European subjects, and to degrade and humiliate the creoles. Wherever in America her sway extends, everything seems to pine and wither beneath its baneful influence. The richest regions of the earth; man, his happiness and his education, all the fine faculties of his soul—are regulated and modified and molded to suit the execrable purposes of an inexorable despotism.

Such is the brief and imperfect picture of the state of things in Spanish America in 1808, when the famous transactions of Bayonne occurred. The King of Spain and the Indies (for Spanish America has always constituted an integral part of the Spanish empire) abdicated his throne and became a voluntary captive. Even at this day one does not know whether he should most condemn the baseness and perfidy of the one party or despise the meanness and imbecility of the other. If the obligation of obedience and allegiance existed on the part of the colonies to the

King of Spain, it was founded on the duty of protection which he owed them. By disqualifying himself for the performance of this duty, they became released from that obligation. The monarchy was dissolved, and each integral part had a right to seek its own happiness by the institution of any new government adapted to its wants. Joseph Bonaparte, the successor *de facto* of Ferdinand, recognized this right on the part of the colonies, and recommended them to establish their independence. Thus, upon the ground of strict right, upon the footing of a mere legal question, governed by forensic rules, the colonies, being absolved by the acts of the parent country from the duty of subjection to it, had an indisputable right to set up for themselves. But I take a broader and a bolder position. I maintain that an oppressed people are authorized, whenever they can, to rise and break their fetters. This was the great principle of the English revolution. It was the great principle of our own. Vattel, if authority were wanting, expressly supports this right. We must pass sentence of condemnation upon the founders of our liberty, say that they were rebels, traitors, and that we are at this moment legislating without competent powers, before we can condemn the cause of Spanish America. Our revolution was mainly directed against the mere theory of tyranny. We had suffered but comparatively little; we had, in some respects, been kindly treated; but our intrepid and intelligent fathers saw, in the usurpation of the power to levy an inconsiderable tax, the long train of oppressive acts that were to follow. They rose; they breasted the storm; they achieved our freedom. Spanish America for centuries has been doomed to the practical effects of an odious tyranny. If we were justified, she is more than justified.

I am no propagandist. I would not seek to force upon other nations our principles and our liberty, if they do not want them. I would not disturb the repose even of a detestable despotism. But if an abused and oppressed people will their freedom, if they seek to establish it, we have a right, as a sovereign power, to notice the fact and to act as circumstances and our interest require. I will say, in the language of the venerated Father of my Country, "born in a land of liberty, my anxious recollections, my sympathetic

feelings, and my best wishes are irresistibly excited whensoever, in any country, I see an oppressed nation unfurl the banners of freedom." Whenever I think of Spanish America, the image irresistibly forces itself upon my mind of an elder brother whose education has been neglected, whose person has been abused and maltreated, and who has been disinherited by the unkindness of an unnatural parent. And when I contemplate the glorious struggle which that country is now making, I think I behold that brother rising, by the power and energy of his fine native genius, to the manly rank which nature, and nature's God, intended for him. . . .

In the establishment of the independence of Spanish America the United States have the deepest interest. I have no hesitation in asserting my firm belief that there is no question in the foreign policy of this country, which has ever arisen, or which I can conceive as ever occurring, in the decision of which we have had or can have so much at stake. This interest concerns our politics, our commerce, our navigation. There cannot be a doubt that Spanish America, once independent, whatever may be the form of government established in its several parts, these governments will be animated by an American feeling and guided by an American policy. They will obey the laws of the system of the new world of which they will compose a part, in contradistinction to that of Europe. Without the influence of that vortex in Europe, the balance of power between its several parts, the preservation of which has so often drenched Europe in blood, America is sufficiently remote to contemplate the new wars which are to afflict that quarter of the globe, as a calm if not a cold and indifferent spectator. In relation to those wars, the several parts of America will generally stand neutral. And as, during the period when they rage, it will be important that a liberal system of neutrality should be adopted and observed, all America will be interested in maintaining and enforcing such a system. The independence of Spanish America, then, is an interest of primary consideration. Next to that, and highly important in itself, is the consideration of the nature of their governments. That is a question, however, for themselves. They will, no doubt,

adopt those kinds of governments which are best suited to their condition, best calculated for their happiness. Anxious as I am that they should be free governments, we have no right to prescribe for them. They are, and ought to be, the sole judges for themselves. I am strongly inclined to believe that they will in most, if not all parts of their country, establish free governments. We are their great example. Of us they constantly speak as of brothers, having a similar origin. They adopt our principles, copy our institutions, and, in many instances, employ the very language and sentiments of our Revolutionary papers:—

"Having then been thus impelled by the Spaniards and their king, we have calculated all the consequences, and have constituted ourselves independent, prepared to exercise the right of nature to defend ourselves against the ravages of tyranny, at the risk of our honor, our lives, and fortune. We have sworn to the only King we acknowledge, the Supreme Judge of the world, that we will not abandon the cause of justice; that we will not suffer the country which he has given us, to be buried in ruins and inundated with blood by the hands of the executioner. . . ."

But it is sometimes said that they are too ignorant and too superstitious to admit of the existence of free government. This charge of ignorance is often urged by persons themselves actually ignorant of the real condition of that people. I deny the alleged fact of ignorance; I deny the inference from that fact, if it were true, that they want capacity for free government. And I refuse assent to the further conclusion if the fact were true, and the inference just, that we are to be indifferent to their fate. All the writers of the most established authority—Depons, Humboldt, and others—concur in assigning to the people of Spanish America great quickness, genius, and particular aptitude for the acquisition of the exact sciences, and others which they have been allowed to cultivate. In astronomy, geology, mineralogy, chemistry, botany, and so forth, they are allowed to make distinguished proficiency. They justly boast of their Abzate, Velasquez, and Gama, and other illustrious contributors to science. They have nine universities, and in the City of Mexico, it is affirmed by Humboldt, there are more solid scientific establishments than in

any city even of North America. I would refer to the message of the supreme director of La Plata, which I shall hereafter have occasion to use for another purpose, as a model of fine composition of a state paper, challenging a comparison with any, the most celebrated, that ever issued from the pens of Jefferson or Madison. Gentlemen will egregiously err if they form their opinions of the present condition of Spanish America from what it was under the debasing system of Spain. The eight years' revolution in which it has been engaged has already produced a powerful effect. Education has been attended to, and genius developed.

"As soon as the project of the revolution arose on the shores of La Plata, genius and talent exhibited their influence; the capacity of the people became manifest, and the means of acquiring knowledge were soon made the favorite pursuit of the youth. As far as the wants or the inevitable interruption of affairs allowed, everything has been done to disseminate useful information. The liberty of the press has indeed met with some occasional checks; but in Buenos Ayres alone, as many periodical works weekly issue from the press as in Spain and Portugal put together."

It is not, therefore, true that the imputed ignorance exists; but if it do, I repeat, I dispute the inference. It is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partizans assert his incapacity, in reference to all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition, it is then demanded to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the dispositions of Providence himself to suppose that he has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man, and for proof I refer to the aborigines of our own land. Were I to speculate in hypotheses unfavorable to human liberty, my speculations should be founded rather upon the vices, refinements, or density of population. Crowded together in compact masses, even if they were philosophers, the contagion of the passions is communicated and caught, and the effect too often, I admit, is the overthrow of liberty. Dispersed over such an immense

space as that on which the people of Spanish America are spread, their physical, and I believe also their moral condition, both favor their liberty.

With regard to their superstition, they worship the same God with us. Their prayers are offered up in their temples to the same Redeemer whose intercession we expect to save us. Nor is there anything in the Catholic religion unfavorable to freedom. All religions united with government are more or less inimical to liberty. All, separated from government, are compatible with liberty. If the people of Spanish America have not already gone as far in religious toleration as we have, the difference in their condition from ours should not be forgottten. Everything is progressive; and, in time, I hope to see them imitating in this respect our example. But grant that the people of Spanish America are ignorant and incompetent for free government, to whom is that ignorance to be ascribed? Is it not to the execrable system of Spain, which she seeks again to establish and to perpetuate? So far from chilling our hearts, it ought to increase our solicitude for our unfortunate brethren. It ought to animate us to desire the redemption of the minds and the bodies of unborn millions from the brutifying effects of a system whose tendency is to stifle the faculties of the soul and to degrade man to the level of beasts. I would invoke the spirits of our departed fathers. Was it for yourselves only that you nobly fought? No, no! It was the chains that were forging for your posterity that made you fly to arms, and, scattering the elements of these chains to the winds, you transmitted to us the rich inheritance of liberty.

GROVER CLEVELAND

ON TARIFF REVISION

[Grover Cleveland, an American statesman, twice elected President of the United States, was born in New Jersey in 1837. In early life he was clerk in a shop in a small New York town, but later, having saved some money, he studied law and began to practice in Buffalo. His attention was drawn to the unfortunate municipal conditions in that city. He engaged, as a Democrat, in the work of reform and was elected sheriff. Later he was chosen mayor of Buffalo. When the Democratic party, early in President Arthur's administration, sought an available candidate for the governorship of New York, Grover Cleveland was finally decided upon. He was elected by a majority of 193,000. His record as executive of the Empire State made him the inevitable candidate of his party in 1884 for President of the United States. He defeated James G. Blaine, the Republican candidate, and for the first time since the Civil War a Democrat occupied the executive seat at Washington. Grover Cleveland's administration was one of general reform, but his tariff message to Congress in the latter half of his term resulted in his defeat for reëlection. In 1892 he was again nominated for the presidency by the Democratic party, and was this time elected. His course in favoring certain bond issues to relieve the drain upon the gold reserve in the United States Treasury was much criticised. In 1896 the national convention of the Democratic party in Chicago failed to indorse his administration, the result being a division within its councils. He retired to private life, but in 1902 appeared as a promoter of harmony in Democratic ranks. The following is a portion of his annual message, issued in 1887, which resulted in his defeat at the next election, Benjamin Harrison being elected by the Republican party.]

THOUGH the situation thus far considered is fraught with danger which should be fully realized, and though it presents features of wrong to the people as well as peril to the country, it is but a result growing out of a perfectly palpable and apparent cause, constantly reproducing the same alarming circumstances—a congested national treasury and a depleted monetary condition in the business

of the country. It need hardly be stated that, while the present situation demands a remedy, we can only be saved from a like predicament in the future by the removal of its cause.

Our scheme of taxation, by means of which this needless surplus is taken from the people and put into the public treasury, consists of a tariff or duty levied upon importations from abroad, and internal revenue taxes levied upon the consumption of tobacco and spirituous and malt liquors. It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessaries. There appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people.

But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty, by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty. So it happens that while comparatively few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never used and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public treasury, but the great majority of our citizens, who buy domestic articles of the same class, pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be con-

stantly reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people.

It is not proposed to entirely relieve the country of this taxation. It must be extensively continued as the source of the government's income; and in a readjustment of our tariff the interests of American labor engaged in manufacture should be carefully considered, as well as the preservation of our manufacturers. It may be called protection, or by any other name, but relief from the hardships and dangers of our present tariff laws should be devised with especial precaution against imperiling the existence of our manufacturing interests. But this existence should not mean a condition which, without regard to the public welfare or a national exigency, must always insure the realization of immense profits instead of moderately profitable returns. As the volume and diversity of our national activities increase, new recruits are added to those who desire a continuation of the advantages which they conceive the present system of tariff taxation directly affords them. So stubbornly have all efforts to reform the present conditions been resisted by those of our fellow citizens thus engaged, that they can hardly complain of the suspicion, entertained to a certain extent, that there exists an organized combination all along the line to maintain their advantage.

We are in the midst of centennial celebrations, and with becoming pride we rejoice in American pride and ingenuity, in American energy and enterprise, and in the wonderful natural advantages and resources developed by a country's national growth. Yet when an attempt is made to justify a scheme which permits a tax to be laid upon every consumer in the land for the benefit of our manufacturers, quite beyond a reasonable demand for government regard, it suits the purposes of advocacy to call our manufactures infant industries, still needing the highest and greatest degree of favor and fostering care that can be wrung from federal legislation.

It is also said that the increase in the price of domestic manufactures resulting from the present tariff is necessary in order that higher wages may be paid to our working men employed in manufactories than are paid for what is called

the pauper labor of Europe. All will acknowledge the force of an argument which involves the welfare and liberal compensation of our laboring people. Our labor is honorable in the eyes of every American citizen; and as it lies at the foundation of our development and progress, it is entitled, without affectation or hypocrisy, to the utmost regard. The standard of our laborers' life should not be measured by that of any other country less favored, and they are entitled to their full share of all our advantages.

By the last census it is made to appear that of the 17,392,099 of our population engaged in all kinds of industries, 7,670,493 are employed in agriculture, 4,074,238 in professional and personal service (2,934,876 of whom are domestic servants and laborers), while 1,810,256 are employed in trade and transportation, and 3,837,112 are classed as employed in manufacturing and mining.

For present purposes, however, the last number given should be considerably reduced. Without attempting to enumerate all, it will be conceded that there should be deducted from those which it includes 375,143 carpenters and joiners, 285,401 milliners, dressmakers, and seamstresses, 172,726 blacksmiths, 133,756 tailors and tailoresses, 102,473 masons, 76,241 butchers, 41,309 bakers, 22,083 plasterers, and 4,891 engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements, amounting in the aggregate to 1,214,023, leaving 2,623,089 persons employed in such manufacturing industries as are claimed to be benefited by a high tariff.

To these the appeal is made to save their employment and maintain their wages by resisting a change. There should be no disposition to answer such suggestions by the allegation that they are in a minority among those who labor, and therefore should forego an advantage, in the interest of low prices for the majority: their compensation, as it may be affected by the operation of the tariff laws, should at all times be scrupulously kept in view; and yet with slight reflection they will not overlook the fact that they are consumers with the rest—that they, too, have their wants and those of their families to supply from their earnings, and that the price of the necessaries of life, as well as the amount of their wages, will regulate the measure of their welfare and comfort.

But the reduction of taxation demanded should be so measured as not to necessitate or justify either the loss of employment by the working man or the lessening of his wages; and the profits still remaining to the manufacturer, after a necessary readjustment, should furnish no excuse for the sacrifice of the interests of his employees, either in their opportunity to work or in the diminution of their compensation. Nor can the worker in manufactures fail to understand that, while a high tariff is claimed to be necessary to allow the payment of remunerative wages, it certainly results in a very large increase in the price of nearly all sorts of manufactures which, in almost countless forms, he needs for the use of himself and family. He receives at the desk of his employer his wages, and perhaps before he reaches his home is obliged, in a purchase for family use of an article which embraces his own labor, to return in the payment of the increase of price which the tariff permits the hard-earned compensation of many days of toil.

The farmer and the agriculturist, who manufacture nothing, but who pay the increased price which the tariff imposes upon every agricultural implement, upon all they wear and upon all they use and own, except the increase of their flocks and herds and such things as their husbandry produces from the soil, are invited to aid in maintaining the present situation; and they are told that a high duty on imported wool is necessary for the benefit of those who have sheep to shear, in order that the price of their wool may be increased. They, of course, are not reminded that the farmer who has no sheep is by this scheme obliged, in his purchase of clothing and woolen goods, to pay a tribute to his fellow farmer as well as to the manufacturer and the merchant; nor is any mention made of the fact that the sheep-owners themselves and their households must wear clothing and use other articles manufactured from the wool they sell at tariff prices, and thus as consumers must return their share of this increased price to the tradesman.

I think it may be fairly assumed that a large proportion of the sheep owned by the farmers throughout the country are found in small flocks numbering from twenty-five to fifty. The duty on the grade of imported wool which these sheep yield is ten cents each pound if of the value of thirty

cents or less, and twelve cents if of the value of more than thirty cents. If the liberal estimate of six pounds be allowed for each fleece, the duty thereon would be sixty or seventy-two cents, and this may be taken as the utmost enhancement of its price to the farmer by reason of this duty. Eighteen dollars would thus represent the increased price of wool from twenty-five sheep, and thirty-six dollars that from the wool of fifty sheep; and at present value this addition would amount to about one-third of its price. If upon its sale the farmer receives this or a less tariff profit, the wool leaves his hands charged with precisely that sum, which in all its changes will adhere to it until it reaches the consumer. When manufactured into cloth and other goods and material for use, its cost is not only increased to the extent of the farmer's tariff profit, but a further sum has been added for the benefit of the manufacturer under the operation of other tariff laws. In the meantime the day arrives when the farmer finds it necessary to purchase woolen goods and material to clothe himself and family for the winter. When he faces the tradesman for that purpose, he discovers that he is obliged not only to return, in the way of increased prices, his tariff profit on the wool he sold, and which then, perhaps, lies before him in manufactured form, but that he must add a considerable sum thereto to meet a further increase in cost caused by a tariff duty on the manufacture. Thus in the end he is aroused to the fact that he has paid upon a moderate purchase, as a result of the tariff scheme which, when he sold his wool, seemed so profitable, an increase in price more than sufficient to sweep away all the tariff profit he received upon the wool he produced and sold.

When the number of farmers engaged in wool-raising is compared with all the farmers in the country, and the same proportion they bear to our population is considered, when it is made apparent that in the case of a large part of those who own sheep the benefit of the present tariff on wool is illusory; and, above all, when it must be conceded that the increase of the cost of living caused by such tariff becomes a burden upon those with moderate means, and the poor, employed and unemployed, the sick and well, and the young and old, and that it constitutes a tax which, with

relentless grasp, is fastened upon the clothing of every man, woman, and child in the land, reasons are suggested why the removal or reduction of this duty should be included in a revision of our tariff laws.

In speaking of the increased cost to the consumer of our home manufactures, resulting from a duty laid upon imported articles of the same description, the fact is not overlooked that competition among our domestic producers sometimes has the effect of keeping the price of their products below the highest limit allowed by such duty. But it is notorious that this competition is too often strangled by combinations quite prevalent at this time, and frequently called trusts, which have for their object the regulation of the supply and price of commodities made and sold by members of this combination. The people can hardly hope for any consideration in the operation of these selfish schemes.

If, however, in the absence of such combination, a healthy and free competition reduces the price of any particular dutiable article of home production below the limit which it might otherwise reach under our tariff laws, and if, with such reduced price, its manufacture continues to thrive, it is entirely evident that one thing has been discovered which should be carefully scrutinized in an effort to reduce taxation.

The necessity of combination to maintain the price of any commodity to the tariff point furnishes proof that some one is willing to accept lower prices for such commodity, and that such prices are remunerative; and lower prices produced by competition prove the same thing. Thus, where either of these conditions exists, a case would seem to be presented for an easy reduction of taxation.

The considerations which have been presented touching our tariff laws are intended only to enforce an earnest recommendation that the surplus revenues of the government be prevented by the reduction of our customs duties, and, at the same time, to emphasize a suggestion that in accomplishing this purpose we may discharge a double duty to our people by granting to them a measure of relief from tariff taxation in quarters where it is most needed and from sources where it can be most fairly and justly accorded.

Nor can the presentation made of such considerations be, with any degree of fairness, regarded as evidence of unfriendliness toward our manufacturing interests, or of any lack of appreciation of their value and importance.

These interests constitute a leading and most substantial element of our national greatness, and furnish the proud proof of our country's progress. But if in the emergency that presses upon us our manufacturers are asked to surrender something for the public good and to avert disaster, their patriotism, as well as a grateful recognition of advantages already afforded, should lead them to willing cooperation. No demand is made that they shall forego all the benefits of governmental regard; but they cannot fail to be admonished of their duty, as well as their enlightened self-interest and safety, when they are reminded of the fact that financial panic and collapse, to which the present condition tends, afford no greater shelter or protection to our manufacturers than to other important enterprises. Opportunity for safe, careful, and deliberate reform is now offered; and none of us should be unmindful of a time when an abused and irritated people, heedless of those who have resisted timely and reasonable relief, may insist upon a radical and sweeping rectification of their wrongs.

The difficulty attending a wise and fair revision of our tariff laws is not underestimated. It will require, on the part of the Congress, great labor and care, and especially a broad and national contemplation of the subject and a patriotic disregard of such local and selfish claims as are unreasonable and reckless of the welfare of the entire country.

Under our present laws more than four thousand articles are subject to duty. Many of these do not in any way compete with our own manufacturers, and many are hardly worth attention as subjects of revenue. A considerable reduction can be made in the aggregate, by adding them to the free list. The taxation of luxuries presents no features of hardship; but the necessaries of life used and consumed by all people, the duty upon which adds to the cost of living in every home, should be greatly cheapened.

The radical reduction of the duties imposed upon raw material used in manufactures, or its free importation, is,

of course, an important factor in any effort to reduce the price of these necessaries; it would not only relieve them from the increased cost caused by the tariff on such material, but the manufactured product being thus cheapened, that part of the tariff now laid upon such product, as a compensation to our manufacturers for the present price of raw material, could be accordingly modified. Such reduction, or free importation, would serve, besides, to largely reduce the revenue. It is not apparent how such a change can have any injurious effect upon our manufacturers. On the contrary, it would appear to give them a better chance in foreign markets with the manufacturers of other countries, who cheapen their wares by free material. Thus our people might have the opportunity of extending their sales beyond the limits of home consumption—saving them from the depression, interruption in business, and loss caused by a glutted domestic market, and affording their employees more certain and steady labor, with its resulting quiet and contentment.

The question thus imperatively presented for solution should be approached in a spirit higher than partisanship, and considered in the light of that regard for patriotic duty which should characterize the action of those entrusted with the weal of a confiding people. But the obligation to declare party policy and principle is not wanting to urge prompt and effective action. Both of the great political parties now represented in the government have, by repeated and authoritative declarations, condemned the condition of our laws which permit the collection from the people of unnecessary revenue, and have, in the most solemn manner, promised its correction; and neither as citizens nor partizans are our countrymen in a mood to condone the deliberate violation of these pledges.

Our progress toward a wise conclusion will not be improved by dwelling upon the theories of protection and free trade. This savors too much of bandying epithets. It is a *condition* which confronts us—not a theory. Relief from this condition may involve a slight reduction of advantages which we award our home productions, but the entire withdrawal of such advantages should not be contemplated. The question of free trade is absolutely irrelevant; and the

persistent claim made in certain quarters, that all efforts to relieve the people from unjust and unnecessary taxation are schemes of so-called free traders, is mischievous and far removed from any consideration for the public good.

The simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the government and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the treasury through the perversion of governmental powers. These things can and should be done with safety to all our industries, without danger to the opportunity for remunerative labor which our working men need, and with benefit to them and all our people, by cheapening their means of subsistence and increasing the measure of their comforts.

The Constitution provides that the President " shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Union." It has been the custom of the executive, in compliance with this provision, to annually exhibit to the Congress, at the opening of its session, the general condition of the country, and to detail, with some particularity, the operations of the different Executive Departments. It would be especially agreeable to follow this course at the present time, and to call attention to the valuable accomplishments of these Departments during the last fiscal year. But I am so much impressed with the paramount importance of the subject to which this communication has thus far been devoted, that I shall forego the addition of any other topic, and only urge upon your immediate consideration the "state of the Union," as shown in the present condition of our treasury and our general fiscal situation, upon which every element of our safety and prosperity depends.

The reports of the heads of Departments, which will be submitted, contain full and explicit information touching the transaction of the business entrusted to them, and such recommendations relating to legislation in the public interest as they deem advisable. I ask for these reports and recommendations the deliberate examination and action of the legislative branch of the government.

There are other subjects, not embraced in the departmental reports, demanding legislative consideration, and

which I should be glad to submit. Some of them, however, have been earnestly presented in previous messages, and as to them, I beg leave to repeat prior recommendations.

As the law makes no provision for any report from the Department of State, a brief history of the transaction of that important Department, together with other matters which it may hereafter be deemed essential to commend to the attention of the Congress, may furnish the occasion for a future communication.

RICHARD COBDEN

FREE TRADE WITH ALL NATIONS

[Richard Cobden, an English economic agitator and popular speaker, noted as "the apostle of free trade," was born in Sussex in 1804. He received an elementary education, and having served as clerk in a warehouse became a commercial traveler. Later he entered the calico-printing business in Manchester, and succeeded. He visited European countries and the United States, and was thus led to form those free trade views for which he is celebrated. In pamphlets and speeches he asserted that England's true policy was the avoidance of war and the extension of commerce. In 1836 an association was formed for the repeal of the corn laws. Into this agitation he threw himself enthusiastically, organizing the movement and strengthening it by effective speeches at popular meetings. He was elected to Parliament in 1841 and proved a ready debater. With John Bright he went from one end of England to the other, spreading the anti-corn agitation to such an extent that the objectionable statutes were repealed in 1846. He continued to sit in Parliament, and although once defeated, he was sent back to the Commons, and remained a member until his death in 1865. He sided with the North during the American Civil War, and urged the non-intervention of England in continental European complications. The speech that follows shows the ideas and principles of the great free-trader, and his earnestness in recommending his favorite theory to the world at large. It was delivered in Manchester in 1846.]

I SHALL begin the few remarks which I have to offer to this meeting by proposing, contrary to my usual custom, a resolution; and it is, "That the merchants, manufacturers, and other members of the National Anti-Corn-Law League claim no protection whatever for the manufactured products of this country, and desire to see obliterated forever the few nominally protective duties against foreign manufactures which still remain upon our statute books." Gentlemen, if any of you have taken the pains to wade through the reports of the protectionist

meetings, as they are called, which have been held lately, you would see that our opponents, at the end of seven years of our agitation, have found out their mistake, and are abandoning the corn laws; and now, like unskilful blunderers as they are, they want to take up a new position, just as we are going to achieve the victory. Then they have been telling something very like fibs when they claimed the corn laws as compensation for peculiar burdens. They say now that they want merely protection in common with all other interests, and they now call themselves the advocates of protection to native industry in all its branches; and, by way of making the appeal to the less-informed portion of the community, they say that the Anti-Corn-Law League are merely the advocates of free trade in corn, but that we want to preserve a monopoly in manufactures.

Now, the resolution which I have to submit to you, and which we will put to this meeting to-night—the largest by far that I ever saw in this room, and comprising men of every class and of every calling in this district—let that resolution decide, once and forever, whether our opponents can with truth lay that to our charge henceforth. There is nothing new in this proposition, for at the very beginning of this agitation—at the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce—when that faint voice was raised in that small room in King Street, in December 1838, for the total and immediate repeal of the corn laws—when that ball was set in motion which has been accumulating in strength and velocity ever since, why, the petition stated fairly that this community wanted no protection for its own industry. I will read the conclusion of that admirable petition. It is as follows:

"Holding one of the principles of eternal justice to be the inalienable right of every man freely to exchange the result of his labor for the productions of other people, and maintaining the practise of protecting one part of the community at the expense of all other classes to be unsound and unjustifiable, your petitioners earnestly implore your honorable house to repeal all laws relating to the importation of foreign corn and other foreign articles of subsistence, and to carry out to the fullest extent, both as affects agriculture and manufactures, the true and peaceful principles of free trade, by removing all existing obstacles to the unrestricted employment of industry and capital."

We have passed similar resolutions at all our great aggregate meetings of delegates in London ever since that was issued.

I don't put this resolution as an argument or as an appeal to meet the appeals made in the protection societies' meetings. I believe that the men who now, in this seventh year of our discussion, can come forth before their country and talk as those men have done—I believe that you might as well preach to the deaf adder. You cannot convince them. I doubt whether they have not been living in their shells, like oysters; I doubt whether they know such a thing is in existence as a railroad, or as penny postage. They are in profound ignorance of everything, and incapable of being taught. We don't appeal to them, but to a very large portion of this community, who don't take a very prominent part in this discussion—who may be considered as important lookers-on. Many have been misled by the reiterated assertions of our opponents; and it is at this eleventh hour to convince these men, and to give them an opportunity of joining our ranks, as they will do, that I offer this proof of disinterestedness and the fairness of our proposals. I don't intend to go into an argument to convince any man here that protection to all must be protection to none. If it takes from one man's pocket, and allows him to compensate himself by taking an equivalent from another man's pocket, and if that goes on in a circle through the whole community, it is only a clumsy process of robbing all to enrich none, and simply has this effect, that it ties up the hands of industry in all directions. I need not offer one word to convince you of that. The only motive that I have for saying a word is, that what I say here may convince others elsewhere—the men who meet in protection societies. But the arguments I should adduce to an intelligent audience like this would be spoken in vain to the members of Parliament who are now the advocates of protection. I shall meet them in less than a week in London, and there I will teach the A B C of this protection. It is of no use trying to teach children words of five syllables, when they have not got out of the alphabet.

Well, what exhibitions these protectionists have been making of themselves! Judging from the length of their

speeches, as you see them reported, you might fancy the whole community was in motion. Fortunately for us, and for the reputation of our countrymen, the men who can utter the driveling nonsense which we have had exhibited to the world lately, and the men who can listen to it, are very few in number. I doubt exceedingly whether all the men who have attended all the protection meetings, during the last month, might not very comfortably be put into this hall. But these protection societies have not only changed their principles, but it seems they have resolved to change their tactics. They have now, at the eleventh hour, again resolved that they will make their body political, and look after the registration. What simpletons they must have been to have thought that they could have done any good without that! So they have resolved that their societies shall spend their money in precisely the same way that the league have been expending theirs. They have hitherto been telling us, in all their meetings and in all their newspapers, that the league is an unconstitutional body; that it is an infernal club which aims at corrupting, at vitiating, and at swamping the registrations; and now, forsooth, when no good can possibly come of it—when they most certainly should have wisely abstained from imitating it, since they cannot do any good, and have kept up the strain they formerly had, of calling the league an unconstitutional body, they resolve to rescind their resolution, and to follow his grace the Duke of Richmond's advice, and fight us with our own weapons. Now, I presume, we are a constitutional body. It is a fortunate thing that we have not got great dukes to lead us. But, now, of what force is this resolution? Like everything they do, it is farcical—it is unreal. The protection societies, from the beginning, have been nothing but phantoms. They are not realities. And what is their resolution—what does it amount to? They resolve that they will look after the registration. We all know that they have done their worst in that way already. We all know that these landlords may really make their acres a kind of electioneering property. We know right well that their land agents are their electioneering agents. We know that their rent rolls have been made their muster rolls for fighting the battle of protection.

These poor driveling people say that we buy qualifications, and present them to our friends; that we bind them down to vote as we please. We have never bought a vote, and we never intend to buy a vote or to give one. Should we not be blockheads to buy votes and give them, when we have ten thousand persons ready to buy them at our request?

But I suspect that our protectionist friends have a notion that there is some plan—some secret, sinister plan—by which they can put fictitious votes on the register. Now I beg to tell them that the league is not more powerful to create votes than it is to detect the flaws in the bad votes of our opponents; and they may depend on it, if they attempt to put fictitious voters on the register, that we have our ferrets in every county, and that they will find out the flaws; and when the registration time comes, we'll have an objection registered against every one of their fictitious qualifications, and make them produce their title deeds, and show that they have paid for them. Well, we have our protectionist opponents; but how we may congratulate ourselves on the position which they have given to this question by the discussion that has been raised everywhere during the last few months! We cannot enter a steamboat or a railroad carriage; nay, we cannot even go into an omnibus, but the first thing that any man does, almost before he has deposited his umbrella, is to ask, "Well, what is the last news about the corn laws?" Now, we, who remember how difficult it was, at the beginning of our agitation, to bring men's minds to the discussion of this question, when we think that every newspaper is now full of it—the same broad sheet containing, perhaps, a report of this meeting, and of the miserable driveling of some hole-and-corner agricultural gathering—and when we think that the whole community is engaged in reading the discussion and pondering on the several arguments, we can desire no more. The league might close its doors to-morrow, and its work might be considered as done the moment it compels or induces people to discuss the question.

But the feeling I have alluded to is spreading beyond our own country. I am glad to hear that in Ireland the question is attracting attention. You have probably heard

that my friend Mr. Bright and I have received a requisition, signed by merchants and manufacturers of every grade and party in Belfast, soliciting us to go there and address them; and I deeply regret that we cannot put our feet on Irish ground to advocate this question. To-day I have received a copy of a requisition to the mayor of Drogheda, calling a meeting for next Monday, to petition for the total and immediate repeal of the corn laws, and I am glad to notice at the head of that requisition the name of the Catholic primate, Doctor Croly, a man eminent for learning, piety, and moderation; and that it is also headed by the rest of the Catholic clergy of that borough. I hope that these examples will not be without their due effect in another quarter. We have, I believe, the majority of every religious denomination with us—I mean the dissenting denominations—we have them almost *en masse*, both ministers and laymen; and I believe the only body, the only religious body, which we may not say we have with us as a body, are the members of the Church of England.

On this point I will just offer this remark: The clergy of the Church of England have been placed in a most invidious, and, I think, an unfortunate position, by the mode in which their tithe commutation charge was fixed some years ago. My friend Colonel Thompson will recollect it, for he was in Parliament at the time, and protested against the way in which the tithe commutation rent charge was fixed. He said, with the great foresight he had always shown in the struggle for the repeal of the corn laws, that it would make the clergy of the Church of England parties to the present corn law by fixing their tithe at a fixed quantity of corn, fluctuating according to the price of the last seven years. Let it be borne in mind that every other class of the community may be directly compensated for the repeal of the corn laws—I mean every class connected with agriculture—except the clergy. The landlords may be compensated, if prices fall, by an increased quantity of produce; so also may the farmer and the laborer; but the clergy of the Church of England receive a given number of quarts of wheat for their tithe, whatever the price may be. I think, however, we may draw a favorable conclusion, under all the circumstances, from the fact that I believe

there has not been one clergyman of the Church of England at all eminent for rank, piety, or learning, who has come out, notwithstanding the strong temptation of personal interest, to advocate the existing corn law. I think that we may take this as a proof of the very strong appeal to justice which this question makes, and perhaps augur also that there is a strong feeling among the great body of the members of the Church of England in favor of free trade in corn.

Well, there is one other quarter in which we have seen the progress of sound principles. I allude to America. We have received the American President's message; we have had also the report of the secretary of the treasury, and both President Polk and Mr. Secretary Walker have been taking my friend Colonel Thompson's task out of his hands, and lecturing the people of America on the subject of free trade. I have never read a better digest of the arguments in favor of free trade than that put forth by Mr. Secretary Walker, and addressed to the Congress of that country. I augur from all these things that our question is making rapid progress throughout the world, and that we are coming to the consummation of our labors. We are verging now toward the session of Parliament, and I predict that the question will either receive its quietus or that it will lead to the dissolution of this parliament; and then the next will certainly relieve us of our burden.

Now, many people are found to speculate on what Sir Robert Peel may do in the approaching session of Parliament. It is a very hazardous thing, considering that in one week only you will be as wise as I shall, to venture to make a prediction on this subject. [A cry of "We are very anxious."] You are very anxious, no doubt. Well, let us see if we can speculate a little on futurity, and relieve our anxiety. There are three courses open to Sir Robert Peel. He may keep the law as it is; he may totally repeal it; or he may do something between the two by tinkering his scale again, or giving us a fixed duty. Now, I predict that Sir Robert Peel will either keep the law as it is or he will propose totally to abolish it. And I ground my prediction on this, because these are the only two things that anybody in the country wants him to do. There are some that want to

keep protection as it is; others want to get rid of it; but nobody wants anything between the two. He has his choice to make, and I have this opinion of his sagacity, that, if he change at all, he will change for total repeal. But the question is, "Will he propose total and immediate repeal?" Now, there, if you please, I will forbear to offer a prediction. But I will venture to give you a reason or two why I think he ought to take total and immediate repeal. I don't think that any class is so much interested in having the corn law totally and immediately repealed as the farming class. I believe that it is of more importance to the farmers to have the repeal instantaneous, instead of gradual, than to any other class of the community. In fact, I observe, in the report of a recent Oxfordshire protection meeting, given in to-day's paper, that when Lord Norreys was alluding to the probability of Sir Robert Peel abolishing the corn laws gradually, a farmer by the name of Gillatt cried out, "We had better be drowned outright than ducked to death." Gentlemen, I used to employ another simile—a very humble one, I admit. I used to say that an old farmer had told me that, if he were going to cut off his sheep-dog's tail, it would be far more humane to cut it off all at once than a piece every day in the week. But now I think that the farmer's simile in Oxford is the newest and the best that we can use. Nothing could be more easy than to demonstrate that it is the true interest of the farmers, if the corn law is to be abolished, to have it abolished instantly. If the corn law were abolished to-morrow, my firm belief is that, instead of wheat falling, it would have a tendency to rise. That is my firm belief, because speculation has already anticipated Sir Robert Peel, and wheat has fallen in consequence of that apprehension. I believe that, owing to the scarcity everywhere—I mean in all parts of Europe—you could not, if you prayed for it, if you had your own wishing-cap on, and could make your own time and circumstances—I believe, I say, that you could never find such an opportunity for abolishing the corn laws totally and immediately as if it were done next week; for it so happens that the very countries from which, in ordinary times, we have been supplied, have been afflicted, like ourselves, with scarcity—that the countries of Europe

are competing with us for the very small surplus existing in America. They have, in fact, anticipated us in that market, and they have left the world's markets so bare of corn that, whatever your necessities may be, I defy you to have other than high prices of corn during the next twelve months, though the corn law was abolished to-morrow.

European countries are suffering as we are from the same evil. They are suffering from scarcity now, owing to the absurd legislation respecting the article of corn. Europe altogether has been corrupted by the vicious example of England in her commercial legislation. There they are, throughout the continent of Europe, with a population increasing at the rate of four or five millions a year; yet they make it their business, like ourselves, to put barriers in the way of a sufficiency of food to meet the demand of an increasing population.

I believe that if you abolish the corn law honestly, and adopt free trade in its simplicity, there will not be a tariff in Europe that will not be changed in less than five years to follow your example. Well, gentlemen, suppose the corn law be not abolished immediately, but that Sir Robert Peel bring in a measure giving you a duty of five shillings, six shillings, or seven shillings, and going down one shilling a year for four or five years, till the whole duty is abolished, what would be the effect on foreign countries? They will then exaggerate the importance of this market when the duty is wholly off. They will go on raising supplies, calculating that, when the duty is wholly off, they will have a market for their produce, and high prices to remunerate them; and if, as is very likely and consistent with our experience, we should have a return to abundant seasons, these vast importations will be poured upon our markets, probably just at the time when our prices are low; and they would come here, because they would have no other market, to swamp our markets, and deprive the farmer of the sale of his produce at a remunerating price. But, on the contrary, let the corn law be abolished instantly; let foreigners see what the English market is in its natural state, and then they will be able to judge from year to year and from season to season what will be the future demand from this country for foreign corn. There will be no extravagant estimate of

what we want—no contingency of bad harvests to speculate upon. The supply will be regulated by the demand, and will reach that state which will be the best security against both gluts and famine. Therefore, for the farmer's sake, I plead for the immediate abolition of this law. A farmer never can have a fair and equitable understanding or adjustment with his landlord, whether as respects rent, tenure, or game, until this law is wholly removed out of his way. Let the repeal be gradual, and the landlord will say to the farmer, through the land agent, "Oh, the duty will be seven shillings next year; you have not had more than twelve months' experience of the workings of the system yet"; and the farmer goes away without any settlement having been come to. Another year passes over, and when the farmer presents himself, he is told, "Oh, the duty will be five shillings this year; I cannot yet tell what the effect will be; you must stop a while." The next year the same thing is repeated, and the end is that there is no adjustment of any kind between the landlord and tenant. But put it at once on a natural footing, abolish all restrictions, and the landlord and tenant will be brought to a prompt settlement; they will be placed precisely on the same footing as you are in your manufactures.

Well, I have now spoken of what may be done. I have told you, too, what I should advocate; but I must say that, whatever is proposed by Sir Robert Peel, we, as free traders, have but one course to pursue. If he propose a total and immediate and unconditional repeal, we shall throw up our caps for Sir Robert Peel. If he propose anything else, then Mr. Villiers will be ready, as he has been on former occasions, to move his amendment for a total and immediate repeal of the corn laws. We are not responsible for what ministers may do; we are but responsible for the performance of our duty. We don't offer to do impossibilities; but we will do our utmost to carry out our principles. But, gentlemen, I tell you honestly, I think less of what this Parliament may do—I care less for their opinions, less for the intentions of the prime minister and the Cabinet, than what may be the opinion of a meeting like this and of the people out of doors. This question will not be carried by ministers or by the present Parliament; it will be carried,

when it is carried, by the will of the nation. We will do nothing that can remove us a hair's breadth from the rock which we have stood upon with so much safety for the last seven years. All other parties have been on the quicksand, and floated about by every wave, by every tide, and by every wind—some floating to us; others, like fragments scattered over the ocean, without rudder or compass; while we are upon solid ground, and no temptation, whether of parties or of ministers, shall ever make us swerve a hair's breadth. I am anxious to hear now, at the last meeting before we go to Parliament—before we enter that arena to which all men's minds will be turned during the next week —I am anxious, not merely that we should all of us understand each other on this question, but that we should be considered as occupying as independent and isolated a position as we did at the first moment of the formation of this league. We have nothing to do with Whigs or Tories; we are stronger than either of them; if we stick to our principles, we can, if necessary, beat both. And I hope we perfectly understand now that we have not, in the advocacy of this great question, a single object in view but that which we have honestly avowed from the beginning. Our opponents may charge us with designs to do other things. No, gentlemen, I have never encouraged that. Some of my friends have said, "When this work is done, you will have some influence in the country; you must do so and so." I said then, as I say now, "Every new political principle must have its special advocates, just as every new faith has its martyrs." It is a mistake to suppose that this organization can be turned to other purposes. It is a mistake to suppose that men, prominent in the advocacy of the principle of free trade, can with the same force and effect identify themselves with any other principle hereafter. It will be enough if the league accomplish the triumph of the principle we have before us. I have never taken a limited view of the object or scope of this great principle. I have never advocated this question very much as a trader.

But I have been accused of looking too much to material interests. Nevertheless, I can say that I have taken as large and great a view of the effects of this mighty principle as ever did any man who dreamt over it in his own study.

I believe that the physical gain will be the smallest gain to humanity from the success of this principle. I look farther; I see in the free trade principle that which shall act on the moral world as the principle of gravitation in the universe, drawing men together, thrusting aside the antagonism of race and creed and language, and uniting us in the bonds of eternal peace. I have looked even farther. I have speculated, and probably dreamt, in the dim future—aye, a thousand years hence—I have speculated on what the effect of the triumph of this principle may be. I believe that the effect will be to change the face of the world, so as to introduce a system of government entirely distinct from that which now prevails. I believe that the desire and the motive for large and mighty empires—for gigantic armies and great navies—for those materials which are used for the destruction of life and the desolation of the rewards of labor—will die away; I believe that such things will cease to be necessary, or to be used, when man becomes one family and freely exchanges the fruits of his labor with his brother man. I believe that, if we could be allowed to reappear on this sublunary scene, we should see, at a far distant period, the governing system of this world revert to something like the municipal system; and I believe that the speculative philosopher of a thousand years hence will date the greatest revolution that ever happened in the world's history from the triumph of the principle which we have met here to advocate. I believe these things; but, whatever may have been my dreams and speculations, I have never obtruded them upon others. I have never acted upon personal or interested motives in this question; I seek no alliance with parties or favor from parties—and I will take none; but having the feeling I have of the sacredness of the principle, I say that I can never agree to tamper with it. I at least will never be suspected of doing otherwise than pursuing it disinterestedly, honestly, and resolutely.

WILLIAM BOURKE COCKRAN

AN ANSWER TO WILLIAM J. BRYAN

[William Bourke Cockran, an Irish-American lawyer and orator, was born in the west of Ireland in 1854. He received his education partly in his native country and partly in France, and when in his seventeenth year came to the United States. His rise to prominence from his admission to the bar has been rapid. He was a member of the lower House of Congress for four years. Subsequently his affiliation with Tammany Hall was relaxed, and upon the adoption of the "sixteen to one" platform by the Democratic party in 1896 he advocated the election of William McKinley as President, but in 1902 a change in local conditions brought him once more into touch with the Tammany organization. The following speech was delivered at the Madison Square Garden in New York City, during the presidential campaign of 1896, which resulted in the election of William McKinley.]

WITH the inspiring strains of the national song still ringing in our ears, who can doubt the issue of this campaign? The issue has been well stated by your presiding officer. Stripped, as he says, of all verbal disguises, it is an issue of common honesty, an issue between the honest discharge and the dishonest repudiation of public and private obligations. It is a question as to whether the powers of the government shall be used to protect honest industry or to tempt the citizen to dishonesty.

On this question honest men cannot differ. It is one of morals and justice. It involves the existence of social order. It is the contest for civilization itself. If it be disheartening to Democrats and to lovers of free institutions to find an issue of this character projecting into a presidential campaign, this meeting furnishes us with an inspiring truth of how that issue will be met by the people. A Democratic convention may renounce the Democratic faith, but the Democracy remains faithful to the Democratic principles,

Democratic leaders may betray a convention to the Populists, but they cannot seduce the footsteps of Democratic voters from the pathway of honor and justice. A candidate bearing the mandate of a Democratic convention may in this hall open a canvass leveled against the foundations of social order, but he beholds the Democratic masses confronting him organized for defense.

Fellow Democrats, let us not disguise from ourselves the fact that we bear in this contest a serious and grave and solemn burden of duty. We must raise our hands against the nominee of our party, and we must do it to preserve the future of that party itself. We must oppose the nominee of the Chicago convention, and we know full well that the success of our opposition will mean our own exclusion from public life, but we will be consoled and gratified by the reflection that it will prove that the American people cannot be divided into parties on a question of simple morals or common honesty. We would look in vain through the speech delivered here one week ago to find a true statement of the issue involved in this canvass. Indeed, I believe it is doubtful if the candidate himself quite understands the nature of the faith which he professes. I say this not in criticism of his ability, but in justice to his morality. I believe that if he himself understood the inevitable consequences of the doctrines he preaches, his own hands would be the very first to tear down the platform on which he stands. But there was one statement in that speech which was very free from ambiguity, pregnant with hope and confidence to the lovers of order. He professes his unquestioned belief in the honesty of the American masses, and he quoted Abraham Lincoln in support of the faith that was in him. Well, I don't believe that the faith of Abraham Lincoln was ever more significantly justified than in the appearance which Mr. Bryan presented upon this platform, in the change that has come over the spirit and the tone of Populistic eloquence since the Chicago convention.

We must all remember that lurid rhetoric which glowed as fiercely in the Western skies as that sunlight which through the past week foretold the torrid heat of the ensuing day; and here upon this platform we find that same

rhetoric as mild, as insipid, as the waters of a stagnant pool.

He is a candidate who was swept into the nomination by a wave of popular enthusiasm, awakened by appeals to prejudice and greed. He is a candidate who on his trip home, and in the initial steps of his trip eastward, declared that this was a revolutionary movement; who no sooner found himself face to face with the American feeling than he realized the fact that this soil is not propitious to revolution.

The people of this country will not change the institutions which have stood the tests and experiences of a century for institutions based upon the fantastic dreams of Populist agitators.

The American nation will never consent to substitute for the Republic of Washington, of Jefferson, and of Jackson, the republic of an Altgeld, a Tillman, or a Bryan. The power of public opinion which caused the vivid oratory of the Chicago platform to burn low and soft as the moonlight outside of this platform, which has already shown its power to control Populistic eloquence, will show the full extent of its wisdom, will give Abraham Lincoln's prophecy its triumphal vindication, when it crushes the seed of Populistic socialism next November.

Now, my friends, I have said that there was one statement of great significance in Mr. Bryan's speech. There is another portion of it which is singularly free from any obscurity and that may be comprised within the two initial paragraphs when he talks, logically, consistently, plainly, the language of revolution. Whatever change may have come over his manner as a candidate, however much the vehemence of his eloquence may have been reduced, two things for which he stands remain unaltered. On this platform he defended the most revolutionary plank of the Chicago convention, in speech less vehement but not less earnest than that in which he supported their adoption. On this platform he defended the Populistic program of overthrowing the integrity of the Supreme Court. If there be any fruit which has grown for the benefit of all mankind, out of the establishment of this republic, it has been the demonstration that it is possible by the organization of an

independent tribunal to safeguard the rights of every citizen and protect those national privileges against any invasion from whatever source or however powerful might be the antagonistic elements. The very existence of that power presupposes the existence of an independent tribunal. Yet we have this Populistic convention, because a Populist measure was condemned as unconstitutional, proposing not to amend the Constitution in the ordinary way prescribed by that instrument itself, but proposing to pack the court, to reorganize it (he used the language of the platform itself), so that it will pronounce those laws to be constitutional which the Constitution itself condemns—a proposal to make the courts of law instruments of lawlessness; to violate that sacred pact between the states on which the security of this nation rests; to profane the temple erected for its protection by the hands of false priests who, though sworn to defend it, will be appointed to destroy it.

In the time to which I must confine myself to-night, I can do nothing but examine that one question, which Mr. Bryan himself declares to be the overshadowing issue of this campaign. I am a little puzzled when I read this speech to decide just exactly what Mr. Bryan himself imagines will be the fruit of a change in the standard of value throughout this country. I do not believe that any man can wholly agree with the speech, because if he dissent from one set of conclusions, he has to read but a few paragraphs and he will find another of a different variety. But I assume that it is fair in a discussion of this character, independently of what Mr. Bryan may say, or what Mr. Bryan himself may think he stands for, to examine the inevitable economic effects of a debasement of the coinage, of a change in the standard by which existing debts are to be measured to a baser measure of value. Now, I will imagine that Mr. Bryan himself may believe that in some way or other he is going to benefit the toilers of this country. He says that he is, but he declines to show us how. For my part, I am willing to state here that if Mr. Bryan could show me that by any means known to heaven or known on earth, any means revealed in the comprehension of man, that wages could be increased, I would be ready to support him here and now. I do not make this statement through any pretense

of special affection for the man who works with his hands. Such a pretense made in the heat of a presidential campaign would merely insult and discredit the intelligence to which it is addressed.

I repeat that I would support any measure calculated to increase the rate of wages, because I know of no test of prosperity absolutely infallible, except the rate of wages paid to laborers. When the rate of wages is high, there must be prosperity; when the rate of wages is low, there must necessarily be distress.

If, then, Mr. Bryan can show me that by any enforcement of any portion of his program wages will be increased in this country, I will not only support him, but I will recognize him as the wisest orator that ever opened his mouth on a platform since the beginning of the world. I will be ready to confess that the rhetoric which I do not now understand is really the language of inspiration. I would regard the administration of the presidency as the kindling of a great light before the footsteps of man, showing him a broad pathway to endless happiness and measureless prosperity. But in searching through his speech, in reading through the whole reams of Populistic literature with which this country has been flooded for four years, I have never yet found the syllable which showed me how a Populist expected to increase the rate of wages. Now, in order to understand the significance of the remark that wages is the only test of prosperity, we have but to consider for a moment just what is meant by the term wages. Wages, as I suppose everybody here understands it, is that part of the laborer's product which is given to him in compensation for his toil. If, for instance, I be engaged in the manufacture of chairs, and if I can make five chairs every day worth $20.00, and the rate of my wages is $4.00 per day, what I actually get is one chair out of the five I make. The other four chairs, the other four-fifths of my product, are devoted to the payment of all the other labor that has been expended in preparing the elements out of which the chair was made: to the man who felled the tree in the forest, the person who sawed it in the mill, the carrier who transported it, the workman who prepared its component parts, and the profit on the capital which set all this labor in motion. It

is plain, however, that I could not take one chair home with me at night and attempt to settle my bills with it, for the moment I undertook to divide the chair among my creditors, that very moment it would lose its value; so instead of taking the chair, which I cannot divide, I take its equivalent in money, which I can divide, but my wages all the time are fixed by the quantity of my own products. If instead of five chairs I were able to make ten, and the rate of compensation remained the same, I would obtain for my wages two chairs, or $8.00 per day; but instead of there being four chairs, or $16.00, available for the payment of the other labor, there would be eight chairs at $32.00; and thus the larger my wages, the larger my product, and the greater the prosperity in the chair-making industry.

Now, applying that principle to every other department of trade, we can see that the man who works on a tunnel cannot take part of the tunnel home with him for his wages, the man who paves the street cannot take part of the highway with him, but each one takes the money equivalent to that part of the product which is the result of his daily toil, and the laborer is the man who has the most vital interest in the character of the money which is paid to him. . . .

Nothing is more common than the mistake that money and property are identical. They are not. A redundancy of money does not prove any prosperity. There may be a very large amount of circulating medium and very great poverty. The issue of paper money simply is no more an increase of wealth than the issue by an individual of his promissory note would show an increase of his property. As a matter of fact, an increase in the coinage is no proof of an increase in property, but may be a strong proof of a decrease in wealth. . . . The volume of money plays but a small part even in the ordinary transactions of life. It is not the volume of money, but the activity of money, that counts. . . . Money never can circulate freely and actively unless there be absolute confidence in its value. If a man doubt whether the money in his pocket will be as valuable to-morrow as it is to-day, he will decline to exchange his commodity against it; and this Populistic agitation threatening the integrity of money has

been the cause of the hard times through which this country is passing and from which it will not escape until the heel of popular condemnation is placed upon the Populistic agitation which undermines the foundation of our credit. . . .

In order that you should understand just how a change in the standard of value enables men to cheat their creditors, you have to consider the function which money plays in measuring debts. If I had paid $10.00 for ten yards of cloth to be delivered to me next week, and in the interim the government should pass a law declaring that hereafter eighteen inches shall constitute a yard, and that all existing contracts shall be settled in that system of measure, I would be cheated of one-half the cloth for which I had paid. If, on the other hand, I owed a cloth merchant for ten yards of cloth which he had delivered to me, and which was payable next week, and in the meantime the government would change the standard of value and cut down the unit of coinage one-half, then I would settle the debt with $5.00, and the cloth merchant would be cheated. . . .

Underlying the whole scheme of civilization is the confidence men have in each other: confidence in their integrity, confidence in their honesty, confidence in their future. If we went to a silver coinage to-morrow, if we even debased our standard of value, men say that you would still have the same property you have to-day, you would still have the same soil, you would still have the same continent. And it is true. But so did the Indians have the same rivers that roll past your cities and turn the wheels of commerce as they pass. So were the mountains piled full of mineral treasures four hundred years ago. The same atmosphere enwrapt this continent, the same soil covered the fields, the same sun shone in heaven, and yet there was none but the savage pursuing the pathway of war through the trackless forests, and the rivers bore no single living thing except the Indian in his canoe, pursuing a pathway of destruction. There was no industrial cooperation, because the Indian was a savage and did not understand the principle by which men aid each other, by taking from the bosom of the earth the wealth which makes life bearable and develops the intelligence which makes civiliza-

tion. Anything that attacks that basis of human confidence is a crime against civilization and a blow against the foundations of social order. . . . We believe that the very essence of civilization is mutual interest, mutual forbearance, mutual cooperation. We believe the world has passed the time when men's hands are at each other's throats. We believe to-day that men stand shoulder to shoulder, working together for a common purpose, beneficial to all, and we believe that this attempt to assail wages, which means an attempt to attack the prosperity of all, will be resisted, not by a class, but by the whole nation. The dweller in the tenement house, stooping over his bench, who never sees a field of waving corn, who never inhales the perfume of grasses and of flowers, is yet made the participator in all the bounties of Providence, in the fructifying influence of the atmosphere, in the ripening rays of the sun, when the product of the soil is made cheaper to him every day by the abundance of the harvest. It is from his share in this bounty that the Populists want to exclude the American working man. To him we say, in the name of humanity, in the name of progress, you shall neither press a crown of thorns upon the brow of labor nor place a scourge upon his back. You shall not rob him of any one advantage which he has gained by long years of study, of progress in the skill of his craft, and by the careful organization of the members who work with him at the same bench. You shall not obscure the golden prospect of a further improvement in his condition by a further appreciation of the cost of living as well as by a further cheapening of the dollar which is paid to him.

There can be no distress, there can be no hard times, when labor is well paid. The man who raises his hand against the progress of the working man raises his hand against prosperity. He seeks to restrict the volume of production. He seeks to degrade the condition of the man who is steadily improving himself, and in his own improvement is accomplishing the improvement of all mankind. But this attempt will fail. I do not regret this campaign. I am glad this issue has arisen. The time has come when the people of this country will show their capacity for self-government. They will prove that the men who have led

the world in the pathway of progress will be the jealous guardians of liberty and honor. They are not to be seduced by appeals to their cupidity or moved by threats of injury. They will forever jealously guard and trim the lamp of enlightenment, of progress. They will ever relentlessly press and crush under their heels the flaming torch of Populistic discontent, Populistic agitation, and Populistic destruction. When this tide of anarchy shall have receded, this tide of Populistic agitation, this assault upon common honesty and upon industry shall have abated forever, the foundations of this republic will remain undisturbed. The government will still shelter a people indissolubly wedded to liberty and order, jealously forbidding any distinction of burden or of privilege, conserving property, maintaining morality, resting forever upon the broad basis of American patriotism and American intelligence.

ROSCOE CONKLING

NOMINATING GENERAL GRANT FOR A THIRD TERM

[Roscoe Conkling was born at Albany, N. Y., 1829. At the age of thirteen he entered the Mount Washington Collegiate Institute in New York City, where he studied several years, and in 1846 entered the law office of Spencer and Kernan. He was admitted to the bar in 1850, and in the same year was appointed district attorney of Oneida County. In 1858 he was elected mayor of Utica. Toward the close of his second term he resigned this office to enter Congress. He was chosen United States senator in January 1867. In a speech in the Senate, Conkling advocated the bill that proposed the formation of an electoral commission. After the election of Garfield, he, with his colleague, Thomas C. Platt, claimed the right to control federal appointments in New York state on the ground of previous agreement with the President. He opposed the appointment of William H. Robertson as collector of the port of New York, and after the appointment was confirmed, Mr. Conkling and Mr. Platt resigned their seats in the Senate, expecting a confirmation of their attitude by a reelection by the Legislature. In this they were disappointed, however, Warner Miller and Elbridge G. Latham being sent to the Senate in their stead. From this time Conkling engaged in law practice in New York. He died in 1888 from the effects of exposure in the great "blizzard" of that year. The speech below was made at the National Convention in Chicago, 1880.]

WHEN asked whence comes our candidate, we say from Appomattox. Obeying instructions I should never dare to disregard, expressing also my own firm conviction, I rise in behalf of the state of New York to propose a nomination with which the country and the Republican party can grandly win. The election before us will be the Austerlitz of American politics. It will decide whether for years to come the country will be "Republican or Cossack." The need of the hour is a candidate who can carry

the doubtful states, north and south; and believing that he more surely than any other can carry New York against any opponent, and carry not only the North, but several states of the South, New York is for Ulysses S. Grant. He alone of living Republicans has carried New York as a presidential candidate. Once he carried it even according to a Democratic count, and twice he carried it by the people's vote, and he is stronger now. The Republican party with its standard in his hand is stronger now than in 1868 or 1872. Never defeated in war or in peace, his name is the most illustrious borne by any living man; his services attest his greatness, and the country knows them by heart. His fame was born not alone of things written and said, but of the arduous greatness of things done; and dangers and emergencies will search in vain in the future, as they have searched in vain in the past, for any other on whom the nation leans with such confidence and trust. Standing on the highest eminence of human distinction, and having filled all lands with his renown—modest, firm, simple, and self-poised—he has seen not only the titled, but the poor and the lowly, in the utmost ends of the world rise and uncover before him. He has studied the needs and defects of many systems of government, and he comes back a better American than ever, with a wealth of knowledge and experience added to the hard common sense which so conspicuously distinguished him in all the fierce light that beat upon him throughout the most eventful, trying, and perilous sixteen years of the nation's history.

Never having had "a policy to enforce against the will of the people," he never betrayed a cause or a friend, and the people will never betray or desert him. Vilified and reviled, truthlessly aspersed by numberless presses, not in other lands, but in his own, the assaults upon him have strengthened and seasoned his hold upon the public heart. The ammunition of calumny has all been exploded; the powder has all been burned once, its force is spent, and General Grant's name will glitter as a bright and imperishable star in the diadem of the Republic when those who have tried to tarnish it will have moldered in forgotten graves and their memories and epitaphs have vanished utterly.

ROSCOE CONKLING

Photogravure after a photograph from life

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

Never elated by success, never depressed by adversity, he has ever, in peace as in war, shown the very genius of common sense. The terms he prescribed for Lee's surrender foreshadowed the wisest principles and prophecies of true reconstruction.

Victor in the greatest of modern wars, he quickly signalized his aversion to war and his love of peace by an arbitration of international disputes which stands as the wisest and most majestic example of its kind in the world's diplomacy. When inflation, at the height of its popularity and frenzy, had swept both houses of Congress, it was the veto of Grant which, single and alone, overthrew expansion and cleared the way for specie resumption. To him, immeasurably more than to any other man, is due the fact that every paper dollar is as good as gold. With him as our leader we shall have no defensive campaign, no apologies or explanations to make. The shafts and arrows have all been aimed at him, and lie broken and harmless at his feet. Life, liberty, and property will find a safeguard in him. When he said of the black man in Florida, "Wherever I am, they may come also," he meant that, had he the power to help it, the poor dwellers in the cabins of the South should not be driven in terror from the homes of their childhood and the graves of their murdered dead. When he refused to receive Denis Kearney, he meant that the lawlessness and communism, although it should dictate laws to a whole city, would everywhere meet a foe in him, and, popular or unpopular, he will hew to the line of right, let the chips fly where they may.

His integrity, his common sense, his courage, and his unequaled experience are the qualities offered to his country. The only argument against accepting them would amaze Solomon. He thought there could be nothing new under the sun. Having tried Grant twice and found him faithful, we are told we must not, even after an interval of years, trust him again. What stultification does not such a fallacy involve? The American people exclude Jefferson Davis from public trust. Why? Because he was the arch traitor and would be a destroyer. And now the same people are asked to ostracize Grant and not trust him. Why? Because he was the arch preserver of his country; because,

not only in war, but afterward, twice as a civic magistrate, he gave his highest, noblest efforts to the Republic. Is such absurdity an electioneering jugglery or hypocrisy's masquerade?

There is no field of human activity, responsibility, or reason in which rational beings object to Grant because he has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting, and because he has had unequaled experience, making him exceptionally competent and fit. From the man who shoes your horse to the lawyer who pleads your case, the officer who manages your railway, the doctor into whose hands you give your life, or the minister who seeks to save your soul, what now do you reject because you have tried him and by his works have known him? What makes the presidential office an exception to all things else in the common sense to be applied to selecting its incumbent? Who dares to put fetters on the free choice and judgment which is the birthright of the American people? Can it be said that Grant has used official power to perpetuate his plan? He has no place. No official power has been used for him. Without patronage or power, without telegraph wires running from his house to the convention, without electioneering contrivances, without effort on his part, his name is on his country's lips, and he is struck at by the whole Democratic party because his nomination will be the death-blow to Democratic success. He is struck at by others who find offense and disqualification in the very service he has rendered and the very experience he has gained. Show me a better man. Name one, and I am answered; but do not point, as a disqualification, to the very facts which make this man fit beyond all others. Let not experience disqualify or excellence impeach him. There is no third term in the case, and the pretense will die with the political dog-days which engendered it. Nobody is really worried about a third term except those hopelessly longing for a first term and the dupes they have made. Without bureaus, committees, officials, or emissaries to manufacture sentiment in his favor, without intrigue or effort on his part, Grant is the candidate whose supporters have never threatened to bolt. As they say, he is a Republican who never wavers. He and his friends stood by the creed and the candidates

of the Republican party, holding the right of a majority as the very essence of their faith, and meaning to uphold that faith against the common enemy and the charlatans and the guerrillas who from time to time deploy between the lines and forage on one side or the other.

The Democratic party is a standing protest against progress. Its purposes are spoils. Its hope and very existence is a solid South. Its success is a menace to prosperity and order.

This convention, as master of a supreme opportunity, can name the next President of the United States and make sure of his election and his peaceful inauguration. It can break the power which dominates and mildews the South. It can speed the nation in a career of grandeur eclipsing all past achievements. We have only to listen above the din and look beyond the dust of an hour to behold the Republican party advancing to victory with its greatest marshal at its head.

THOMAS CORWIN

AGAINST WAR WITH MEXICO

[Thomas Corwin, "the prince of political campaign orators," as he was styled in his day, was born in Kentucky in 1794. He grew to manhood in Ohio on a farm tilled by his father, but his early educational advantages were limited. He studied law in his spare moments, and was admitted to the bar at the age of twenty-three. His readiness as a speaker had attracted the attention of those who came in contact with him while he was growing to manhood, the result being that he was often asked to address public meetings throughout the backwoods country. He was elected to the legislature of Ohio in 1822, and eight years later to Congress. He sat ten years in the House of Representatives, adding to his reputation as a speaker, and was then elected governor of Ohio. He became United States Senator from that state in 1845, making a noted speech against the war with Mexico before that body. In President Fillmore's Cabinet he was secretary of the treasury, and in 1858 he was back in the House of Representatives at Washington, remaining there until President Lincoln made him minister to Mexico. He died in 1865. The speech given below is a fiery denunciation of the war between the United States and Mexico, and was delivered in the United States Senate in 1847.]

YOU may wrest provinces from Mexico by war; you may hold them by the right of the strongest; you may rob her; but a treaty of peace to that effect with the people of Mexico, legitimately and freely made, you never will have! I thank God that it is so, as well for the sake of the Mexican people as ourselves; for, unlike the senator from Alabama [Mr. Bagby], I do not value the life of a citizen of the United States above the lives of a hundred thousand Mexican women and children—a rather cold sort of philosophy in my judgment. For the sake of Mexico, then, as well as our own country, I rejoice that it is an impossibility that you can obtain by treaty from her those territories, under the existing state of things.

I am somewhat at a loss to know on what plan gentlemen having charge of this war intend to proceed. We hear much said of the terror of your arms. The affrighted Mexican, it is said, when you have drenched his country in blood, will sue for peace, and thus you will indeed "conquer peace." This is the heroic and savage tone in which we have heretofore been lectured by our friends on the other side of the chamber, especially by the senator from Michigan [Mr. Cass]. But suddenly the chairman of the committee on foreign relations comes to us with the smooth phrase of diplomacy, made potent by the gentle suasion of gold. The chairman of the committee on military affairs calls for thirty millions of money and ten thousand regular troops; these, we are assured, shall "conquer peace," if the obstinate Celt refuses to treat till we shall whip him in another field of blood. What a delightful scene in the nineteenth century of the Christian era! What an interesting sight to see these two representatives of war and peace moving in grand procession through the halls of the Montezumas! The senator from Michigan [Mr. Cass], red with the blood of recent slaughter, the gory spear of Achilles in his hand, and the hoarse clarion of war at his mouth, blowing a blast "so loud and deep" that the sleeping echoes of the lofty Cordilleras start from their caverns and return to the sound, till every ear from Panama to Santa Fé is deafened with the roar! By his side, with "modest mien and downcast look," comes the senator from Arkansas [Mr. Sevier], covered from head to foot with a gorgeous robe, glittering and embossed with three millions of shining gold, putting to shame "the wealth of Ormus or of Ind." The olive of Minerva graces his brow; in his right hand is the delicate rebec, from which are breathed in Lydian measure notes "that tell of naught but love and peace." I fear very much that you will scarcely be able to explain to the simple mind of the half-civilized Mexican the puzzling dualism of this scene, at once gorgeous and grotesque. Sir, I scarcely understand the meaning of all this myself. If we are to vindicate our rights by battles—in bloody fields of war—let us do it. If that is not the plan, why, then, let us call back our armies into our own territory, and propose a treaty with Mexico, based upon

the proposition that money is better for her and land for us. Thus we can treat Mexico like an equal, and do honor to ourselves. But what is it you ask? You have taken from Mexico one-fourth of her territory, and you now propose to run a line comprehending about another third, and for what? I ask, Mr. President, for what? What has Mexico got from you for parting with two-thirds of her domain? She has given you ample redress for every injury of which you have complained. She has submitted to the award of your commissioners, and, up to the time of the rupture with Texas, faithfully paid it. And for all that she has lost (not through or by you, but which loss has been your gain), what requital do we, her strong, rich, robust neighbor, make? Do we send our missionaries there "to point the way to heaven"? Or do we send the schoolmasters to pour daylight into her dark plans, to aid her infant strength to conquer, and reap the fruit of the independence herself alone had won? No, no; none of this do we. But we send regiments, storm towns, and our colonels prate of liberty in the midst of the solitudes their ravages have made. They proclaim the empty forms of social compact to a people bleeding and maimed with wounds received in defending their hearthstones against the invasion of these very men who shoot them down and then exhort them to be free. Your chaplains of the navy throw away the New Testament, and seize a bill of rights. The Rev. Don Walter Colton, I see, abandons the Sermon on the Mount, and betakes himself to Blackstone and Kent, and is elected a justice of the peace! He takes military possession of some town in California, and instead of teaching the plan of the atonement and the way of salvation to the poor ignorant Celt, he presents a Colt's pistol to his ear and calls on him to take "trial by jury and habeas corpus," or nine bullets in his head. Ah, Mr. President, are you not the light of the earth, if not its salt? You, you are indeed opening the eyes of the blind in Mexico with a most emphatic and exoteric power. Sir, if all this were not a mournful truth, it would be the *ne plus ultra* of the ridiculous. But, sir, let us see what, as the chairman of the committee on foreign relations explains it, we are to get by the combined processes of conquest and treaty.

What is the territory, Mr. President, which you propose to wrest from Mexico? It is consecrated to the heart of the Mexican by many a well-fought battle with his old Castilian master. His Bunker Hills, and Saratogas, and Yorktowns are there! The Mexican can say: "There I bled for liberty! and shall I surrender that consecrated home of my affections to the Anglo-Saxon invaders? What do they want with it? They have Texas already. They have possessed themselves of the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. What else do they want? To what shall I point my children as memorials of that independence which I bequeath to them, when those battle-fields shall have passed from my possession?"

Sir, had one come and demanded Bunker Hill of the people of Massachusetts, had England's lion ever showed himself there, is there a man over thirteen and under ninety who would not have been ready to meet him? Is there a river on this continent that would not have run red with blood? Is there a field but would have been piled high with unburied bones of slaughtered Americans before these consecrated battle-fields of liberty should have been wrested from us? But this same American goes into a sister republic, and says to poor, weak Mexico: "Give up your territory, you are unworthy to possess it; I have got one-half already, and all I ask of you is to give up the other!" England might as well, in the circumstances I have described, have come and demanded of us: "Give up the Atlantic slope—give up this trifling territory from the Alleghany Mountains to the sea; it is only from Maine to St. Mary's—only about one-thrd of your republic, and the least interesting portion of it." What would be the response? They would say we must give this up to John Bull. Why? "He wants room." The senator from Michigan says he must have this. Why, my worthy Christian brother—on what principle of justice? "I want room!"

Sir, look at this pretense of want of room. With twenty millions of people, you have about one thousand millions of acres of land, inviting settlement by every conceivable argument, bringing them down to a quarter of a dollar an acre, and allowing every man to squat where he pleases. But the senator from Michigan says we will be two hun-

dred millions in a few years, and we want room. If I were a Mexican, I would tell you: "Have you not room enough in your own country to bury your dead? If you come into mine, we will meet you with bloody hands, and welcome you to hospitable graves."

"Why," says the chairman of this committee on foreign relations, "it is the most reasonable thing in the world! We ought to have the bay of San Francisco!" Why? Because it is the best harbor on the Pacific! It has been my fortune, Mr. President, to have practised a good deal in criminal courts in the course of my life, but I never yet heard a thief, arraigned for stealing a horse, plead that it was the best horse he could find in the country! We want California. What for? Why, says the senator from Michigan, we will have it; and the senator from South Carolina, with a very mistaken view, I think, of policy, says you can't keep our people from going there. I don't desire to prevent them. Let them go and seek their happiness in whatever country or clime it pleases them. All I ask of them is, not to require this government to protect them with that banner consecrated to war waged for principles—eternal, enduring truth. Sir, it is not meet that our old flag should throw its protecting folds over expeditions for lucre or for land. But you still say you want room for your people. This has been the plea of every robber chief from Nimrod to the present hour. I dare say when Tamerlane descended from his throne, built of seventy thousand human skulls, and marched his ferocious battalions to further slaughter—I dare say he said, "I want room." Bajazet was another gentleman of kindred tastes and wants with us Anglo-Saxons—he "wanted room." Alexander, too, the mighty "Macedonian madman," when he wandered with his Greeks to the plains of India, and fought a bloody battle on the very ground where recently England and the Sikhs engaged in strife for "room," was, no doubt, in quest of some California there. Many a Monterey had he to storm to get "room." Sir, he made as much of that sort of history as you ever will. Mr. President, do you remember the last chapter in that history? It is soon read. Ah, I wish we could but understand its moral. Ammon's son (so was Alexander named), after all his victories, died drunk in Babylon!

The vast empire he conquered, to "get room," became the prey of the generals he had trained: it was dismembered, torn to pieces, and so ended. Sir, there is a very significant appendix; it is this: the descendants of the Greeks, Alexander's Greeks, are now governed by a descendant of Attila! Mr. President, while we are fighting for room, let us ponder deeply this appendix. I was somewhat amazed the other day to hear the senator from Michigan declare that Europe had quite forgotten us, till these battles waked them up. I suppose the senator feels grateful to the President for "waking up" Europe. Does the President, who is, I hope, read in civic as well as military lore, remember the saying of one who had pondered upon history long—long, too, upon man, his nature, and true destiny? Montesquieu did not think highly of this way of "waking up." "Happy," says he, "is that nation whose annals are tiresome."

The senator from Michigan has a different view. He thinks that a nation is not distinguished until it is distinguished in war. He fears that the slumbering faculties of Europe have not been able to ascertain that there are twenty millions of Anglo-Saxons here, making railroads and canals, and speeding all the arts of peace to the utmost accomplishment of the most refined civilization! They do not know it! And what is the wonderful expedient which this democratic method of making history would adopt in order to make us known? Storming cities, desolating peaceful, happy homes; shooting men—aye, sir, such is war—and shooting women, too.

Sir, I have read in some account of your battle of Monterey, of a lovely Mexican girl who, with the benevolence of an angel in her bosom and the robust courage of a hero in her heart, was busily engaged during the bloody conflict —amid the crash of falling houses, the groans of the dying, and the wild shriek of battle—in carrying water to slake the burning thirst of the wounded of either host. While bending over a wounded American soldier, a cannon ball struck her and blew her to atoms! Sir, I do not charge my brave, generous-hearted countrymen who fought that fight with this. No, no. We who send them—we who know that scenes like this, which might send tears of sorrow "down Pluto's iron cheek," are the invariable, inevitable attend-

ants on war—we are accountable for this; and this—this is the way we are to be made known to Europe. This—this is to be the undying renown of free, republican America: "she has stormed a city, killed many of its inhabitants of both sexes—she has room!" So it will read. Sir, if this were our only history, then may God in His mercy grant that its volume may speedily come to a close.

Why is it, sir, that we of the United States, a people of yesterday compared with the older nations of the world, should be waging war for teritory, for "room"? Look at your country, extending from the Alleghany Mountains to the Pacific Ocean,-capable itself of sustaining in comfort a larger population than will be in the whole Union for one hundred years to come. Over this vast expanse of territory your population is now so sparse that I believe we provided at the last session a regiment of mounted men to guard the mail from the frontier of Missouri to the mouth of the Columbia; and yet you persist in the ridiculous assertion, "I want room." One would imagine from the frequent reiteration of the complaint that you had a bursting, teeming population, whose energy was paralyzed, whose enterprise was crushed, for want of space. Why should we be so weak or wicked as to offer this idle apology for ravaging a neighboring republic? It will impose on no one, at home or abroad.

Do we not know, Mr. President, that it is a law, never to be repealed, that falsehood shall be short-lived? Was it not ordained of old that truth only shall abide forever? Whatever we may say to-day, or whatever we may write in our books, the stern tribunal of history will review it all, detect falsehood, and bring us to judgment before that posterity which shall bless or curse us as we may act now, wisely or otherwise. We may hide in the grave which awaits us all—in vain! We may hope to be concealed there, like the foolish bird that hides its head in the sand, in the vain belief that its body is not seen; yet, even there, this preposterous excuse of want of "room" shall be laid bare, and the quick-coming future will decide that it was a hypocritical pretense, under which we sought to conceal the avarice which prompted us to covet and to seize, by force, that which was not ours.

Mr. President, this uneasy desire to augment our territory has depraved the moral sense and blighted the otherwise keen sagacity of our people. What has been the fate of all nations who have acted upon the idea that they must advance thus? Our young orators cherish this notion with a fervid, but fatally mistaken zeal. They call it by the mysterious name of "destiny." "Our destiny," they say, "is onward"; and hence they argue, with ready sophistry, the propriety of seizing upon any territory and any people that may lie in the way of our "fated" advance. Recently these "progressives" have grown classical; some assiduous student of antiquities has helped them to a patron saint. They have wandered back into the desolated Pantheon, and there, among the polytheistic relics of that "pale mother of dead empires," they have found a god whom these Romans, centuries gone by, baptized "Terminus."

Sir, I have heard much and read somewhat of this gentleman, Terminus. Alexander, of whom I have spoken, was a devotee of this divinity. We have seen the end of him and his empire. It was said to be an attribute of this god, that he must always advance, and never recede. So both republican and imperial Rome believed. It was, as they said, their destiny. And for a while it did seem to be even so. Roman Terminus did advance. Under the eagles of Rome he was carried from his home on the Tiber to the farthest East on the one hand, and to the far West, among the then barbarous tribes of western Europe, on the other. But at length the time came when retributive justice had become "a destiny." The despised Gaul cries out to the contemned Goth, and Attila, with his Huns, answers back the battle-shout to both. The "blue-eyed nations of the North," in succession or united, pour forth their countless hosts of warriors upon Rome and Rome's always advancing god, Terminus. And now the battle-ax of the barbarians strikes down the conquering eagle of Rome. Terminus at last recedes, slowly at first, but finally he is driven to Rome, and from Rome to Byzantium. Whoever would know the further fate of this Roman deity, so recently taken under the patronage of American democracy, may find ample gratification of his curiosity in the luminous pages of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall." Such will find that Rome

thought, as you now think, that it was her destiny to conquer provinces and nations, and no doubt she sometimes said, as you say, "I will conquer a peace." And where now is she, the mistress of the world? The spider weaves her web in her palaces, the owl sings his watch-song in her towers. Teutonic power now lords it over the servile remnant, the miserable memento of old and once omnipotent Rome. Sad, very sad, are the lessons which time has written for us. Through and in them all I see nothing but the inflexible execution of that old law which ordains, as eternal, that cardinal rule, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods, nor anything which is his." Since I have lately heard so much about the dismemberment of Mexico, I have looked back to see how, in the course of events which some call "Providence," it has fared with other nations who engaged in this work of dismemberment. I see that in the latter half of the eighteenth century three powerful nations —Russia, Austria, and Prussia—united in the dismemberment of Poland. They said, too, as you say, "It is our destiny." They "wanted room." Doubtless each of these thought, with his share of Poland, his power was too strong ever to fear invasion, or even insult. One had his California, another his New Mexico, and the third his Vera Cruz. Did they remain untouched and incapable of harm? Alas, no! Far, very far, from it! Retributive justice must fulfil its "destiny," too. A very few years pass, and we hear of a new man, a Corsican lieutenant, the self-named "armed soldier of democracy"—Napoleon. He ravages Austria, covers her land with blood, drives the Northern Cæsar from his capital, and sleeps in his palace. Austria may now remember how her power trampled upon Poland. Did she not pay dear, very dear, for her California?

But has Prussia no atonement to make? You see this same Napoleon, the blind instrument of Providence, at work there. The thunders of his cannon at Jena proclaim the work of retribution for Poland's wrongs; and the successors of the great Frederick, the drill sergeant of Europe, are seen flying across the sandy plain that surrounds their capital, right glad if they may escape captivity or death. But how fares it with the autocrat of Russia? Is he secure in his share of the spoils of Poland? No. Suddenly we

see, sir, six hundred thousand armed men marching to Moscow. Does his Vera Cruz protect him now? Far from it. Blood, slaughter, desolation, spread abroad over the land, and finally the conflagration of the old commercial metropolis of Russia closes the retribution; she must pay for her share in the dismemberment of her weak and impotent neighbor. Mr. President, a mind more prone to look for the judgments of Heaven in the doings of men than mine cannot fail in this to see the providence of God. When Moscow burned, it seemed as if the earth was lighted up that the nations might behold the scene. As that mighty sea of fire gathered and heaved, and rolled upward, higher and yet higher, till its flames aspired the stars and lit the whole heavens, it did seem as though the God of nations was writing, in characters of flame on the front of his throne, the doom that shall fall upon a strong nation which tramples in scorn upon the weak. And what fortune awaits him, the appointed executor of this work, when it is all done? He, too, conceived the notion that his "destiny" pointed onward to universal dominion. France was too small—Europe, he thought, should bow down before him. But as soon as this idea took possession of his soul, he, too, became powerless. His Terminus must recede, too. Right there, while he witnessed the humiliation, and doubtless meditated the subjugation of Russia, He who holds the winds in His fist, gathered the snows of the north and blew them upon his six hundred thousand men. They fled—they froze—they perished! And now the mighty Napoleon, who had resolved on universal dominion—he, too, is summoned to answer for the violation of that ancient law, "Thou shalt not covet anything which is thy neighbor's." How is the mighty fallen! He beneath whose proud footstep Europe trembled—he is now an exile at Elba, and now finally a prisoner on the rock of St. Helena. And there, on a barren island, in an unfrequented sea in the crater of an extinguished volcano—there is the deathbed of the mighty conqueror! All his annexations have come to that! His last hour is now come, and he, "the Man of Destiny," he who had rocked the world as with the throes of an earthquake, is now powerless and still. Even as the beggar dies, so he died. On the wings of a tempest that raged

with unwonted fury, up to the throne of the only power that controlled him while he lived, went the fiery soul of that wonderful warrior, another witness to the existence of that eternal decree that they who do not rule in righteousness shall perish from the earth. He has found "room" at last. And France—she, too, has found "room." Her "eagles" now no longer scream upon the banks of the Danube, the Po, and the Borysthenes. They have returned home to their old aerie between the Alps, the Rhine, and the Pyrenees; so shall it be with your banners of conquest. You may carry them to the loftiest peaks of the Cordilleras, they may wave with insolent triumph in the halls of the Montezumas, the armed men of Mexico may quail before them, but the weakest hand in Mexico, uplifted in prayer to the God of justice, may call down against you a Power in the presence of which the iron hearts of your warriors shall be turned into ashes.

Mr. President, if the history of our race has established any truth, it is but a confirmation of what is written, "The way of the transgressor is hard." Inordinate ambition, wantoning in power and spurning the humble maxims of justice, ever has ended and ever shall end in ruin. Strength cannot always trample upon weakness; the humble shall be exalted; the bowed down will at length be lifted up. It is by faith in the law of strict justice, and the practise of its precepts, that nations alone can be saved. All the annals of the human race, sacred and profane, are written over with this great truth in characters of living light. It is my fear, my fixed belief, that in this invasion, this war with Mexico, we have forgotten this vital truth. Why is it that we have been drawn into this whirlpool of war? How clear and strong was the light that shone upon the path of duty a year ago! The last disturbing question with England was settled. Our power extended its peaceful sway from the Atlantic to the Pacific: from the Alleghanies we looked out upon Europe, and from the tops of the Stony Mountains we could descry the shores of Asia; a rich commerce with all the nations of Europe poured wealth and abundance into our lap on the Atlantic side, while an unoccupied commerce of three hundred millions of Asiatics waited on the Pacific for our enterprise to come and possess it. One

hundred millions of dollars will be wasted in this fruitless war. Had this money of the people been expended in making a railroad from your northern lakes to the Pacific, as one of your citizens has begged of you in vain, you would have made a highway for the world between Asia and Europe. Your capital then would be within thirty or forty days' travel of any and every point on the map of the civilized world. Through this great artery of trade you would have carried through the heart of your own country the teas of China and the spices of India to the markets of England and France. Why, why, Mr. President, did we abandon the enterprises of peace and betake ourselves to the barbarous achievements of war? Why did we "forsake this fair and fertile field to batten on that moor"?

But, Mr. President, if further acquisition of territory is to be the result either of conquest or treaty, then I scarcely know which should be preferred, external war with Mexico or the hazards of internal commotion at home, which last I fear may come if another province is to be added to our territory. There is one topic connected with this subject which I tremble when I approach, and yet I cannot forbear to notice it. It meets you in every step you take; it threatens you which way soever you go in the prosecution of this war. I allude to the question of slavery. Opposition to its further extension, it must be obvious to every one, is a deeply rooted determination with men of all parties in what we call the non-slaveholding states. New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, three of the most powerful, have already sent their legislative instructions here. So it will be, I doubt not, in all the rest. It is vain now to speculate about the reasons for this. Gentlemen of the South may call it prejudice, passion, hypocrisy, fanaticism. I shall not dispute with them now on that point. The great fact that it is so, and not otherwise, is what it concerns us to know. You and I cannot alter or change this opinion, if we would. These people only say we will not, cannot consent that you shall carry slavery where it does not already exist. They do not seek to disturb you in that institution as it exists in your states. Enjoy it if you will, and as you will. This is their language; this their determination. How is it in the South? Can it be ex-

pected that they should expend in common their blood and their treasure in the acquisition of immense territory, and then willingly forego the right to carry thither their slaves, and inhabit the conquered country if they please to do so? Sir, I know the feelings and opinions of the South too well to calculate on this. Nay, I believe they would even contend to any extremity for the mere right, had they no wish to exert it. I believe (and I confess I tremble when the conviction presses upon me) that there is equal obstinacy on both sides of this fearful question. If, then, we persist in war, which, if it terminates in anything short of a mere wanton waste of blood as well as money, must end (as this bill proposes) in the acquisition of territory to which at once this controversy must attach—this bill would seem to be nothing less than a bill to produce internal commotion. Should we prosecute this war another moment, or expend one dollar in the purchase or conquest of a single acre of Mexican land, the North and the South are brought into collision on a point where neither will yield. Who can foresee or foretell the result? Who so bold or reckless as to look such a conflict in the face unmoved! I do not envy the heart of him who can realize the possibility of such a conflict without emotions too painful to be endured. Why, then, shall we, the representatives of the sovereign states of this Union, the chosen guardians of this confederated republic, why should we precipitate this fearful struggle, by continuing a war the result of which must be to force us at once upon a civil conflict? Sir, rightly considered, this is treason—treason to the Union, treason to the dearest interests, the loftiest aspirations, the most cherished hopes of our constituents. It is a crime to risk the possibility of such a contest. It is a crime of such infernal hue that every other in the catalogue of iniquity, when compared with it, whitens into virtue. Oh, Mr. President, it does seem to me, if hell itself could yawn and vomit up the fiends that inhabit its penal abodes, commissioned to disturb the harmony of this world and dash the fairest prospect of happiness that ever allured the hopes of men, the first step in the consummation of this diabolical purpose would be to light up the fires of internal war and plunge the sister states of this Union into the bottomless gulf of

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Photogravure after a photograph



THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

civil strife. We stand this day on the crumbling brink of that gulf—we see its bloody eddies wheeling and boiling before us—shall we not pause before it be to late? How plain again is here the path, I may add the only way, of duty, of prudence, of true patriotism. Let us abandon all idea of acquiring further territory, and by consequence cease at once to prosecute this war. Let us call home our armies, and bring them at once within our own acknowledged limits. Show Mexico that you are sincere when you say you desire nothing by conquest. She has learned that she cannot encounter you in war, and if she had not, she is too weak to disturb you here. Tender her peace, and, my life on it, she will then accept it. But whether she shall or not, you will have peace without her consent. It is your invasion that has made war; your retreat will restore peace. Let us then close forever the approaches of internal feud, and so return to the ancient concord and the old ways of national prosperity and permanent glory. Let us here, in this temple consecrated to the Union, perform a solemn lustration; let us wash Mexican blood from our hands, and on these altars, and in the presence of that image of the Father of his Country that looks down upon us, swear to preserve honorable peace with all the world, and eternal brotherhood with each other.

ROBERT G. COUSINS

ON THE "MAINE" DISASTER

[Robert G. Cousins, an American publicist and orator of distinction, was born in Iowa in 1859. Having graduated at Cornell, in Iowa, he became a member of the bar of his native state. He attained distinction not only for professional acumen, but for oratorical gifts which made him, while still a very young man, a prominent political figure. His work as a Republican campaign winner led to his nomination for the state legislature. He came prominently before the country in connection with the Brown impeachment, which was tried before the Iowa senate. In this trial young Cousins was revealed as a man of solid as well as brilliant qualities. He was elected to Congress in 1892, and has been reëlected continuously ever since. The speech given below was delivered in the House of Representatives in March, 1898, the month following the destruction of the U. S. man-of-war "Maine."]

MR. SPEAKER: Whether this measure shall prevail, either in the form in which it has come from the committee or in the form as proposed in the amendment, it is both appropriate and just; but hardly is it mentionable in contemplation of the great calamity to which it appertains. It will be an incidental legislative foot-note to a page of history that shall be open to the eyes of this republic and of the world for all time to come. No human speech can add anything to the silent gratitude, the speechless reverence, already given by a great and grateful nation to its dead defenders and to their living kin. No act of Congress providing for their needs can make a restitution for their sacrifice. Human nature does, in human ways, its best, and still feels deep in debt.

Expressions of condolence have come from every country and from every clime, and every nerve of steel and ocean cable has carried on electric breath the sweetest, tenderest words of sympathy for that gallant crew who

manned the "Maine." But no human recompense can reach them. Humanity and time remain their everlasting debtors.

It was a brave and strong and splendid crew. They were a part of the blood and bone and sinew of our land. Two of them were from my native state of Iowa. Some were only recently at the United States Naval Academy, where they had so often heard the morning and evening salutation to the flag—that flag which had been interwoven with the dearest memories of their lives, that had colored all their friendships with the lasting blue of true fidelity. But whether they came from naval school or civil life, from one state or another, they called each other comrade—that gem of human language which sometimes means but a little less than love and a little more than friendship, that gentle salutation of the human heart which lives in all the languages of man, that winds and turns and runs through all the joys and sorrows of the human race, through deed and thought and dream, through song and toil and battle-field.

No foe had ever challenged them. The world can never know how brave they were. They never knew defeat; they never shall. While at their posts of duty, sleep lured them into the abyss; then death unlocked their slumbering eyes but for an instant to behold its dreadful carnival, most of them just when life was full of hope and all its tides were at their highest, grandest flow; just when the early sunbeams were falling on the steeps of fame and flooding all life's landscape far out into the dreamy, distant horizon; just at that age when all the nymphs were making diadems and garlands, waving laurel wreaths before the eyes of young and eager nature—just then, when death seemed most unnatural.

Hovering above the dark waters of that mysterious harbor of Havana, the black-winged vulture watches for the dead, while over it and over all there is the eagle's piercing eye sternly watching for the truth.

Whether the appropriation carried by this resolution shall be ultimately charged to fate or to some foe shall soon appear. Meanwhile a patient and a patriotic people, enlightened by the lessons of our history, remembering the

woes of war, both to the vanquished and victorious, are ready for the truth and ready for their duty.

"The tumult and the shouting dies—
The captains and the kings depart—
Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
A humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget."

OLIVER CROMWELL

ON THE DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT

[Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of the English Commonwealth, a great English statesman, was born in Huntingdon in 1599. He studied for a time at Cambridge and settled down to the retired life of a country gentleman until 1640, when he entered public life and came to the front as the leader of that element in the nation which would not submit to royal pretension. His brilliant military genius secured the triumph of his party and his own advancement to the office of Lord Protector of the English Commonwealth. Of that Commonwealth he may be regarded as, in a sense, the creator. Under his rule England's prestige abroad was high and order was maintained at home, but the government was, on the whole, arbitrary and despotic, although not oppressive. He died in 1658. Early in 1658 the House of Commons refused to acknowledge Cromwell's House of Peers, whereupon he dissolved his parliament, after making the following speech.]

GENTLEMEN: I perceive you are here as the house of Parliament, by your speaker, whom I see here, and by your faces, which are in a great measure known to me.

When I first met you in this room it was to my apprehension the hopefulest day that ever mine eyes saw, as to the considerations of this world. For I did look at, as wrapt up in you together with myself, the hopes and the happiness of—though not of the greatest—yet a very great "people"; and the best people in the world. And truly and unfeignedly I thought it so: as a people that have the highest and clearest profession amongst them of the greatest glory, namely, religion; as a people that have been, like other nations, sometimes up and sometimes down in our honor in the world, but yet never so low but we might measure with other nations; and a people that have had a stamp upon them from God, God having, as it were,

summed up all our former honor and glory in the things that *are* of glory to nations, in an epitome, within these ten or twelve years last past! So that we knew one another at home, and are well known abroad.

And if I be not very much mistaken, we were arrived—as I, and truly, I believe, as many others, did think—at a very safe port, where we might sit down and contemplate the dispensations of God and our mercies, and might know our mercies not to have been like to those of the ancients, who did make out their peace and prosperity, as they thought, by their own endeavors; who could not say, as we, that all ours were let down to us from God himself! Whose appearances and providences amongst us are not to be outmatched by any story. Truly this was our condition. And I know nothing else we had to do, save as Israel was commanded in that most excellent psalm of David:

"The things which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us, we will not hide them from our children; showing to the generation to come the praises of the Lord, and His strength, and His wonderful works that He hath done. For He established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel; which He commanded our fathers that they should make known to their children; that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to *their* children: that they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep His commandments."

This, I thought, had been a song and a work worthy of England, whereunto you might happily have invited them, had you had hearts unto it. You had this opportunity fairly delivered unto you. And if a history shall be written of these times and transactions, it will be said—it will not be denied—that these things that I have spoken are true! This talent was put into your hands. And I shall recur to that which I said at the first: I came with very great joy and contentment and comfort, the first time I met you in this place. But we and these nations are, for the present, under some disappointment! If I had proposed to have played the orator—which I never did affect, nor do, nor I

hope shall—I doubt not but upon easy suppositions, which I am persuaded every one among you will grant, we did meet upon such hopes as these.

I met you a second time here, and I confess at that meeting I had much abatement of my hopes, though not a total frustration. I confess that that which damped my hopes so soon was somewhat that did look like a parricide. It is obvious enough unto you that the then management of affairs did savor of a not owning—too-too much savor, I say, of a not owning of the authority that called you hither. But God left us not without an expedient that gave a second possibility. Shall I say possibility? It seemed to me a probability, of recovering out of that dissatisfied condition we were all then in, towards some mutuality of satisfaction. And therefore by that recognition, suiting with the indenture that returned you hither; to which afterwards was also added your own declaration,* conformable to, and in acceptance of, that expedient; thereby, I say, you had, though with a little check, another opportunity renewed unto you to have made this nation as happy as it could have been if everything had smoothly run on from that first hour of your meeting. And indeed—you will give me liberty of my thoughts and hopes—I did think, as I have formerly found in that way that I have been engaged in as a soldier, that some affronts put upon us, some disasters at the first, have made way for very great and happy successes; and I did not at all despond but the stop put upon you, in like manner, would have made way for a blessing from God. That interruption being, as I thought, necessary to divert you from violent and destructive proceedings, to give time for better deliberations; whereby leaving the government as you found it, you might have proceeded to have made those good and wholesome laws which the people expected from you, and might have answered the grievances, and settled those other things proper to you as a Parliament; for such you would have thanks from all that intrusted you.

What hath happened since that time I have not taken public notice of, as declining to intrench on Parliament privileges. For sure I am you will all bear me witness,

* Commons Journals (vii. 368), 14th September, 1654.

that from your entering into the House upon the recognition, to this very day, you have had no manner of interruption or hindrance of mine in proceeding to what blessed issue the heart of a good man could propose to himself—to this very day none. You see you have me very much locked up, as to what you have transacted among yourselves, from that time to this. But some things I shall take liberty to speak of to you.

As I may not take notice what you have been doing, so I think I have a very great liberty to tell you that I do not know what you have been doing! I do not know whether you have been alive or dead. I have not once heard from you all this time; I have not: and that you all know. If that be a fault that I have not, surely it hath not been mine! If I have had any melancholy thoughts, and have sat down by them, why might it not have been very lawful for me to think that I was a person judged unconcerned in all these businesses? I can assure you I have not so reckoned myself! Nor did I reckon myself unconcerned in you. And so long as any just patience could support my expectation, I would have waited to the uttermost to have received from you the issue of your consultations and resolutions. I have been careful of your safety, and the safety of those that you represented, to whom I reckon myself a servant.

But what messages have I disturbed you withal? What injury or indignity hath been done, or offered, either to your persons or to any privileges of Parliament, since you sat? I looked at myself as strictly obliged by my oath, since your recognizing the government in the authority of which you were called hither and sat, to give you all possible security, and to keep you from any unparliamentary interruption. Think you I could not say more upon this subject, if I listed to expatiate thereupon? But because my actions plead for me, I shall say no more of this. I say, I have been caring for *you*, for your quiet sitting; caring for your privileges, as I said before, that they might not be interrupted; have been seeking of God, from the great God, a blessing upon you, and a blessing upon these nations. I have been consulting if possibly I might, in anything, promote, in my place, the real good of this Parliament, of the

hopefulness of which I have said so much unto you. And I did think it to be my business rather to see the utmost issue, and what God would produce by you, than unseasonably to intermeddle with you. But, as I said before, I have been caring for you, and for the peace and quiet of these nations: indeed I have; and that I shall a little presently manifest unto you. And it leadeth me to let you know somewhat, which, I fear, I fear, will be, through some interpretation, a little too justly put upon *you*, whilst you have been employed as you have been, and—in all that time expressed in the government, in that government, I say in that government—have brought forth nothing that you yourselves say *can* be taken notice of without infringement of your privileges. I will tell you somewhat, which, if it be not news to you, I wish you had taken very serious consideration of. If it be news, I wish I had acquainted you with it sooner. And yet if any man will ask me why I did it not, the reason is given already: Because I did make it my business to give you no interruption.

There be some trees that will not grow under the shadow of other trees; there be some that choose—a man may say so by way of allusion—to thrive under the shadow of other trees. I will tell you what hath thriven. I will not say what you have *cherished* under your shadow; that were too hard. Instead of peace and settlement, instead of mercy and truth being brought together, and righteousness and peace kissing each other, by your reconciling the honest people of these nations, and settling the woful distempers that are amongst us, which had been glorious things and worthy of Christians to have proposed—weeds and nettles, briers and thorns have thriven under your shadow! Dissettlement and division, discontent and dissatisfaction, together with real dangers to the whole, have been more multiplied within these five months of your sitting than in some years before! Foundations have also been laid for the future renewing of the troubles of these nations by all the enemies of them abroad and at home. Let not these words seem too sharp, for they are true as any mathematical demonstrations are or can be. I say, the enemies of the peace of these nations abroad and at home, the discontented humors throughout these nations—which products

I think no man will grudge to call by that name, of briers and thorns—*they* have nourished themselves under your shadow!

And that I may clearly be understood: they have taken their opportunities from your sitting, and from the hopes they had, which with easy conjecture they might take up and conclude that there would be no settlement; and they have framed their designs, preparing for the execution of them accordingly. Now whether—which appertains not to me to judge of, on their behalf—they had any occasion ministered for this, and from whence they had it, I list not to make any scrutiny or search. But I will say this: I think they had it not from me. I am sure they had not from me. From whence they had, is not my business nor to discourse; but *that* they had, is obvious to every man's sense. What preparations they have made, to be executed in such a season as they thought fit to take their opportunity from: that I know, not as men know things by conjecture, but by certain, demonstrable knowledge. That they have been for some time past furnishing themselves with arms, nothing doubting that they should have a day for it, and verily believing that, whatsoever their former disappointments were, they should have more done for them by and from our own divisions than they were able to do for themselves. I desire to be understood that, in all I have to say of this subject, you will take it that I have no reservation in my mind—as I have not—to mingle things of guess and suspicion with things of fact, but "that" the things I am telling of are fact: things of evident demonstration.

These weeds, briers, and thorns, they have been preparing, and have brought their designs to some maturity, by the advantages given to them, as aforesaid, from your sittings and proceedings. But by the Waking Eye that watched over that cause that God will bless, they have been, and yet are, disappointed. And having mentioned that cause, I say, that slighted cause—let me speak a few words in behalf thereof, though it may seem too long a digression. Whosoever despiseth it, and will say, it is *non causa pro causa*, "a cause without a cause," the All-searching Eye before mentioned will find out that man, and will judge him

as one that regardeth not the works of God nor the operations of His hands! For which God hath threatened that He will cast men down, and not build them up. That man who, because he can dispute, will tell us he knew not when the cause began, nor where it is, but modeleth it according to his own intellect, and submits not to the appearances of God in the world, and therefore lifts up his heel against God, and mocketh at all His providences, laughing at the observations, made up not without reason, and the Scriptures, and by the quickening and teaching spirit which gives life to these other, calling such observations "enthusiasms"; such men, I say, no wonder if they "stumble and fall backwards, and be broken and snared and taken," by the things of which they are so wilfully and malicously ignorant! The Scriptures say, "The rod has a voice, and He will make Himself known by the judgments which He executeth." And do we not think He will, and does, by the providences of mercy and kindness which He hath for His people and their just liberties; "whom He loves as the apple of His eye"? Doth He not by them manifest Himself? And is He not thereby also seen giving kingdoms for them, "giving men for them, and people for their lives," as it is in Isaiah forty-third? Is not this as fair a lecture and as clear speaking as anything our dark reason, left to the letter of the Scriptures, can collect from them? By this voice has God spoken very loud on behalf of His people, by judging their enemies in the late war, and restoring them a liberty to worship, with the freedom of their consciences, and freedom in estates and persons when they do so. And thus we have found the cause of God by the works of God, which are the testimony of God. Upon which rock whosoever splits shall suffer shipwreck. But it is your glory, and it is mine, if I have any in the world concerning the interest of those that have an interest in a better world—it is my glory that I know a cause which yet we have *not* lost, but do hope we shall take a little pleasure rather to lose our lives than lose! But you will excuse this long digression.

I say unto you, whilst you have been in the midst of these transactions, that party, that Cavalier party—I could wish some of them had thrust in here to have heard what

I say—have been designing and preparing to put this nation in blood again, with a witness. But because I am confident there are none of that sort here, therefore I shall say the less to that. Only this I must tell you: they have been making great preparations of arms, and I do believe it will be made evident to you that they have raked out many thousands of arms, even all that this city could afford, for divers months last past. But it will be said, "May we not arm ourselves for the defense of our houses? Will anybody find fault for that?" Not for that. But the reason for *their* doing so hath been as explicit, and under as clear proof, as the fact of doing so. For which I hope, by the justice of the land, some will, in the face of the nation, answer it with their lives, and then the business will be pretty well out of doubt. Banks of money have been framing for these and other suchlike uses. Letters have been issued with privy seals to as great persons as most are in the nation, for the advance of money, which "letters" have been discovered to us by the persons themselves. Commissions for regiments of horse and foot, and command of castles, have been likewise given from Charles Stuart, since your sitting. And what the general insolences of that party have been, the honest people have been sensible of, and can very well testify.

It hath not only been thus. But as in a quinsy or pleurisy, where the humor fixeth in one part, give it scope, all "disease" will gather to that place, to the hazarding of the whole, and it is natural to do so till it destroy life in that person on whomsoever this befalls. So likewise will *these* diseases take accidental causes of aggravation of their distemper. And this was that which I did assert, that they have taken accidental causes for the growing and increasing of those distempers—as much as would have been in the natural body if timely remedy were not applied. And indeed things were come to that pass, in respect of which I shall give you a particular account, that no mortal physician, if the Great Physician had not stepped in, could have cured the distemper. Shall I lay this upon your account, or my own? I am sure I can lay it upon God's account, that if He had not stepped in, the disease had been mortal and destructive!

And what is all this? "What are these new diseases that have gathered to this point?" Truly I must needs still say, "A company of men like briers and thorns," and worse, if worse can be. Of another sort than those before mentioned to you. These also have been and yet are endeavoring to put us into blood and into confusion, more desperate and dangerous confusion than England ever yet saw. And I must say, as when Gideon commanded his son to fall upon Zeba and Zalmunna, and slay them, they thought it more noble to die by the hand of a man than of a stripling, which shows there is some contentment in the hand by which a man falls; so it is some satisfaction, if a commonwealth must perish, that it perish by men, and not by the hands of persons differing little from beasts! That if it must needs suffer, it should rather suffer from rich men than from poor men, who, as Solomon says, "when they oppress, leave nothing behind them, but are as a sweeping rain." Now such as these also are grown up under your shadow. But it will be asked, What have they done? I hope, though they pretend "Commonwealth's interest," they have had no encouragement from you, but have, as in the former case, rather taken it than that you have administered any cause unto them for so doing—"any cause" from delays, from hopes that this Parliament would not settle, from pamphlets mentioning strange votes and resolves of yours, which I hope did abuse you! But thus you see that whatever the grounds were, these have been the effects. And thus I have laid these things before you, and you and others will be easily able to judge how far you are concerned.

"What these men have done?" They also have labored to pervert, where they could, and as they could, the honest-meaning people of the nation. They have labored to engage some in the army; and I doubt not that not only they, but some others also, very well known to you, have helped to this work of debauching and dividing the army. They have, they have! I would be loath to say who, where, and how. Much more loath to say they were any of your own number. But I can say, endeavors have been made to put the army into a distemper, and to feed that which is the worst humor in the army, which, though it was not a mas-

tering humor, yet these took advantage from delay of the settlement, and the practises before mentioned, and the stopping of the pay of the army, to run us into free-quarter, and to bring us into the inconveniences most to be feared and avoided. What if I am able to make it appear, in fact, that some amongst you have run into the City of London, to persuade to petitions and addresses to you for reversing your own votes that you have passed? Whether these practises were in favor of your liberties, or tended to beget hopes of peace and settlement from you, and whether debauching the army in England, as is before expressed, and starving it, and putting it upon free-quarter, and occasioning and necessitating the greatest part thereof in Scotland to march into England, leaving the remainder thereof to have their throats cut there, and kindling by the rest a fire in our own bosoms, were for the advantage of affairs here, let the world judge!

This I tell you also, that the correspondence held with the interest of the Cavaliers, by that party of men called Levelers, who call themselves Commonwealth's men, is in our hands. Whose declarations were framed to that purpose, and ready to be published at the time of their projected common rising, whereof, "I say," we are possessed; and for which we have the confession of themselves now in custody; who confess also they built their hopes upon the assurance they had of the Parliament's not agreeing to a settlement. Whether these humors have not nourished themselves under your boughs is the subject of my present discourse, and I think I shall say not amiss if I affirm it to be so. And I must say it again, that that which hath been their advantage, thus to raise disturbance, hath been by the loss of those golden opportunities which God had put into your hands for settlement. Judge you whether these things were thus, or not, when you first sat down. I am sure things were not thus! There was a very great peace and sedateness throughout these nations, and great expectations of a happy settlement, which I remembered to you at the beginning of my speech, and hoped that you would have entered on your business as you found it.

There was a government already in the possession of the people—I say a government in the possession of the people

—for many months. It hath now been exercised near fifteen months; and if it were needful that I should tell you *how* it came into their possession, and how willingly they received it; how all law and justice were distributed from it, in every respect, as to life, liberty, and estate; how it was owned by God, as being the dispensation of His providence after twelve years' war; and sealed and witnessed unto by the people—I should but repeat what I said in my last speech unto you in this place, and therefore I forbear. When you were entered upon this government, raveling into it—you know I took no notice what you were doing. If you had gone upon that foot of account, to have made such good and wholesome provisions for the good of the people of these nations as were wanted, for the settling of such matters in things of religion as would have upheld and given countenance to a godly ministry, and yet as would have given a just liberty to godly men of different judgments—"to" men of the same faith with them that you call the Orthodox Ministry in England, as it is well known the Independents are, and many under the form of baptism, who are sound in the faith, and though they may, perhaps, be different in judgment in some lesser matters, yet as true Christians both looking for salvation only by faith in the blood of Christ, men professing the fear of God, and having recourse to the name of God as to a strong tower—I say you might have had opportunity to have settled peace and quietness amongst all professing godliness, and might have been instrumental, if not to have healed the breaches, yet to have kept the godly of all judgments from running one upon another, and by keeping them from being overrun by a common enemy, "have" rendered them and these nations both secure, happy, and well satisfied.

Are these things done, or any things towards them? Is there not yet upon the spirits of men a strange itch? Nothing will satisfy them unless they can press their finger upon their brethren's consciences, to pinch them there. To do this was no part of the contest we had with the common adversary. For "indeed" religion was not the thing at first contested for "at all,"* but God brought it to that issue at

* Power of the militia was the point upon which the actual war began. A statement not false; yet truer in form than it is in essence.—*Carlyle.*

last, and gave it unto us by way of redundancy, and at last it proved to be that which was most dear to us. And wherein consisted this more than in obtaining that liberty from the tyranny of the bishops to all species of Protestants to worship God according to their own light and consciences? For want of which many of our brethren forsook their native countries to seek their bread from strangers, and to live in howling wildernesses, and for which also many that remained here were imprisoned, and otherwise abused and made the scorn of the nation. Those that were sound in the faith, how proper was it for them to labor for liberty, for a just liberty, that men might not be trampled upon for their consciences! Had not they themselves labored, but lately, under the weight of persecution? And was it fit for them to sit heavy upon others? Is it ingenuous to ask liberty, and not to give it? What greater hypocrisy than for those who were oppressed by the bishops to become the greatest oppressors themselves, so soon as their yoke was removed? I could wish that they who call for liberty now also had not too much of that spirit, if the power were in their hands! As for profane persons, blasphemers, such as preach sedition; the contentious railers, evil speakers, who seek by evil words to corrupt good manners; persons of loose conversation—punishment from the civil magistrate ought to meet with these. Because, if they pretend conscience, yet walking disorderly and not according, but contrary to the Gospel, and even to natural lights, they are judged of all. And their sins being open, make them subjects of the magistrate's sword, who ought not to bear it in vain. The discipline of the army *was* such that a man would not be suffered to remain there of whom we could take notice he was guilty of such practises as these.

And therefore how happy would England have been, and you and I, if the Lord had led you on to have settled upon such good accounts as these are, and to have discountenanced such practises as the other, and left men in disputable things free to their own consciences! Which was well provided for by the "instrument of" government, and liberty left to provide against what was apparently evil. Judge you whether the contesting for things that were provided for by this government hath been profitable expense of

time for the good of these nations! By means whereof you may see you have wholly elapsed your time, and done just nothing! I will say this to you in behalf of the Long Parliament, that had such an expedient as this government been proposed to them, and could they have seen the cause of God thus provided for, and been, by debates, enlightened in the grounds "of it," whereby the difficulties might have been cleared "to them," and the reason of the whole enforced, and the circumstances of time and persons, with the temper and disposition of the people, and affairs both abroad and at home when it was undertaken might have been well weighed "by them": I think in my conscience—well as they were taught to love their seats—they would have proceeded in another manner than you have done, and *not* have exposed things to these difficulties and hazards they now are at, nor given occasion to leave the people so dissettled as they now are. Who, I dare say, in the soberest and most judicious part of them, did expect, not a question, but a doing of things in pursuance of the "instrument of" government. And if I be not misinformed, very many of you came up with this satisfaction, having had time enough to weigh and consider the same.

And when I say "such an expedient as this government"—wherein I dare assert there is a just liberty to the people of God, and the just rights of the people in these nations provided for—I can put the issue thereof upon the clearest reason, whatsoever any go about to suggest to the contrary. But this not being the time and place of such an averment, "I forbear at present." For satisfaction's sake herein, enough is said in a book entitled "A State of the Case of the Commonwealth," published in January, 1653.* And for myself, I desire not to keep my place in this government an hour longer than I may preserve England in its just rights, and may protect the people of God in such a just liberty of their consciences as I have already mentioned. And therefore, if this Parliament have judged things to be otherwise than as I have stated them, it had been huge friendliness between persons who had such a reciprocation in so great concernments to the public, for

* "Printed by Thomas Newcomb, London, 1653-4;"—"wrote with great spirit of language and subtilty of argument," says the "Parliamentary History" (xx. 419).

them to have convinced me in what particulars therein my error lay! Of which I never yet had a word from you! But if, instead thereof, your time has been spent in setting up somewhat else, upon another bottom than this stands "upon," it looks as if the laying grounds for a *quarrel* had rather been designed than to give the people *settlement.* If it be thus, it's *well* your labors have not arrived to any maturity at all!

This government called you hither, the constitution thereof being limited so—a single person and a Parliament. And this was thought most agreeable to the general sense of the nation, having had experience enough, by trial, of other conclusions, judging this most likely to avoid the extremes of monarchy on the one hand, and of democracy on the other, and yet not to found *Dominium in Gratia* "either." And if so, then certainly to make the authority more than a mere notion, it was requisite that it should be as it is in this "frame of" government, which puts it upon a true and equal balance. It has been already submitted to the judicious, true, and honest people of this nation whether the balance be not equal. And what their judgment is, is visible—by submission to it, by acting upon it, by restraining their trustees from meddling with it. And it neither asks nor needs any better ratification. But when trustees in Parliament shall, by experience, find any evil in any parts of this "frame of" government, "a question" referred by the government itself to the consideration of the Protector and Parliament—of which evil or evils time itself will be the best discoverer—how can it be reasonably imagined that a person or persons, coming in by election, and standing under such obligations, and so limited, and so necessitated by oath to govern for the people's good, and to make *their* love, under God, the best underpropping and only safe footing—how can it, I say, be imagined that the present or succeeding protectors will refuse to agree to alter any such thing in the government as may be found to be for the good of the people, or to recede from anything which they might be convinced casts the balance too much to the single person? And although, for the present, the keeping up and having in his power the militia seems the hardest "condition," yet if the power of the militia should

be yielded up at such a time as this, when there is as much need of it to keep this cause (now most evidently impugned by all enemies) as there was to *get* it "for the sake of this cause," what would become of us all? Or if it should not be equally placed in him and the Parliament, but yielded up *at any time*, it determines his power either for doing the good he ought, or hindering Parliaments from perpetuating themselves, from imposing what religion they please on the consciences of men, or what government they please upon the nation, thereby subjecting us to dissettlement in every Parliament, and to the desperate consequences thereof. And if the nation *shall* happen to fall into a blessed peace, how easily and certainly will their charge be taken off, and their forces be disbanded! And then where will the danger be to have the militia thus stated? What if I should say: If there *be* a disproportion, or disequality, as to the power, it is on the other hand!

And if this be so, wherein have you had cause to quarrel? What demonstrations have you held forth to settle me to your opinion? I would you had made me so happy as to have let me know your grounds! I have made a free and ingenuous confession of my faith to *you*. And I could have wished it had been in your hearts to have agreed that some friendly and cordial debates might have been toward mutual conviction. Was there none amongst you to move such a thing? No fitness to listen to it? No desire of a right understanding? If it be not folly in me to listen to town talk, such things *have* been proposed, and rejected with stiffness and severity, once and again. Was it not likely to have been more advantageous to the good of this nation? I will say this to you for myself, and to that I have my conscience as a thousand witnesses, and I have my comfort and contentment in it; and I have the witness, too, of divers here, who, I think truly, would scorn to own me in a lie, that I would not have been averse to any alteration of the good of which I might have been convinced, although I could not have agreed to the taking it off the foundation on which it stands, namely, the acceptance and consent of the people.

I will not presage what you have been about, or doing,

in all this time. Nor do I love to make conjectures. But I must tell you this, that as I undertook this government in the simplicity of my heart, and as before God, and to do the part of an honest man, and to be true to the interest—which in my conscience "I think" is dear to many of you, though it is not always understood what God in His wisdom may hide from us, as to peace and settlement—so I can say that no particular interest, either of myself, estate, honor, or family, are, or have been, prevalent with me to this undertaking. For if you had, upon the old government, offered me this one, this one thing—I speak as thus advised, and before God, as having been to this day of this opinion; and this hath been my constant judgment, well known to many who hear me speak—if, "I say," this one thing had been inserted, this one thing, that the government should have been placed in my family hereditary, I would have rejected it! And I could have done no other according to my present conscience and light. I will tell you my reason, though I cannot tell what God *will* do with me, nor with you, nor with the nation, for throwing away precious opportunities committed to us.

This hath been my principle, and I liked it, when this government came first to be proposed to me, that it puts us off that hereditary way. Well, looking that God hath declared what government He delivered to the Jews, and that he placed it upon such persons as had been instrumental for the conduct and deliverance of His people; and considering that promise in Isaiah, "That God would give rulers as at the first, and judges as at the beginning," I did not know but that God might "now" begin, and though at present with a most unworthy person, yet, as to the future, it might be after this manner, and I thought this might usher it in! I am speaking as to my judgment against making government hereditary. To have men chosen for their love to God, and to truth, and justice, and not to have it hereditary. For as it is in the Ecclesiastes, "Who knoweth whether he may beget a fool or a wise man?" Honest or not honest, whatever they be, they must come in on that plan, because the government is made a patrimony—and this I, perhaps, do declare with too much earnestness, as being my own concernment—and know not

what place it may have in your hearts, and in those of the good people in the nation. But however it be, I have comfort in this my truth and plainness.

I have thus told you my thoughts, which truly I have declared to you in the fear of God, as knowing He will not be mocked, and in the strength of God, as knowing and rejoicing that I am supported in my speaking, especially when I do not form or frame things without the compass of integrity and honesty, so that my own conscience gives me not the lie to what I say. And then in what I say I can rejoice.

Now to speak a word or two to you. Of that, I must profess in the name of the same Lord, and wish there had been no cause that I should have thus spoken to you! I told you that I came with joy the first time, with some regret the second; yet now I speak with most regret of all! I look upon you as having among you many persons that I could lay down my life individually for. I could, through the grace of God, desire to lay down my life for you. So far am I from having an unkind or unchristian heart towards you in your particular capacities! I have this indeed as a work most incumbent upon me; this of speaking these things to you. I consulted what might be my duty in such a day as this, casting up all considerations. I must confess, as I told you, that I did think occasionally this nation had suffered extremely in the respects mentioned, as also in the disappointment of their expectations of that justice which was due to them by your sitting thus long. "Sitting thus long," and what have you brought forth? I did not nor cannot comprehend what it is. I would be loath to call it a fate; that were too paganish a word. But there hath been something in it that we had not in our expectations.

I did think, also, for myself, that I am like to meet with difficulties, and that this nation will not, as it is fit it should not, be deluded with *pretexts* of necessity in that great business of raising of money. And were it not that I can make some dilemmas upon which to resolve some things of my conscience, judgment, and actions, I should shrink at the very prospect of my encounters. Some of them are general, some are more special. Supposing this cause or this business must be carried on, it is either of God or of

man. If it be of man, I would I had never touched it with a finger. If I had not had a hope fixed in me that this cause and this business was of God, I would many years ago have run from it. If it be of God, He will bear it up. If it be of man, it will tumble; as everything that hath been of man since the world began hath done. And what are all our histories, and other traditions of actions in former times, but God manifesting Himself, that He hath shaken, and tumbled down and trampled upon everything that He had not planted? And as this is, so let the All-wise God deal with it. If this be of human structure and invention, and if it be an old plotting and contriving to bring things to this issue, and that they are not the births of Providence, then they will tumble. But if the Lord take pleasure in England, and if He will do us good, He is very able to bear us up! Let the difficulties be whatsoever they will, we shall in His strength be able to encounter with them. And I bless God I have been inured to difficulties, and I never found God failing when I trusted in Him. I can laugh and sing, in my heart, when I speak of these things to you or elsewhere. And though some may think it is an hard thing to raise money without parliamentary authority upon this nation; yet I have another argument to the good people of this nation, if they would be safe, and yet have no better principle: Whether they prefer the having of their will though it be their destruction, rather than comply with things of necessity? That will excuse me. But I should wrong my native country to suppose this.

For I look at the people of these nations as the blessing of the Lord, and they are a people blessed by God. They have been so, and they will be so, by reason of that immortal seed which hath been, and is, among them—those regenerated ones in the land of several judgments, who are all the flock of Christ, and lambs of Christ. "His," though perhaps under many unruly passions and troubles of spirit, whereby they give disquiet to themselves and others; yet they are not so to God, since to us He is a God of other patience, and He will own the least of truth in the hearts of His people. And the people being the blessing of God, they will not be so angry but they will prefer their safety to their passions, and their real security to forms, when

necessity calls for supplies. Had they not well been acquainted with this principle, they had never seen this day of Gospel liberty.

But if any man shall object, "It is an easy thing to talk of necessities when men create necessities: would not the Lord Protector make himself great and his family great? Doth not he make these necessities? And then he will come upon the people with his argument of necessity!" This was something hard indeed. But I have *not* yet known what it is to "make necessities," whatsoever the thoughts or judgments of men are. And I say this, not only to this assembly, but to the world, that the man liveth not who can come to me and charge me with having, in these great revolutions, "made necessities." I challenge even all that fear God. And as God hath said, "My glory I will not give unto another," let men take heed and be twice advised how they call His revolutions, the things of God, and His working of things from one period to another—how, I say, they call them necessities of men's creation! For by so doing they do vilify and lessen the works of God, and rob Him of His glory, which He hath said He will not give unto another, nor suffer to be taken from Him! We know what God did to Herod, when he was applauded and did not acknowledge God. And God knoweth what He will do with men when they call His revolutions human designs, and so detract from His glory. These issues and events have not been forecast, but were sudden providences in things, whereby carnal and worldly men are enraged, and under and at which many, and I fear some good men, have murmured and repined, because disappointed of their mistaken fancies. But still all these things have been the wise disposings of the Almighty, though instruments have had their passions and frailties. And I think it is an honor to God to acknowledge the necessities to have been of God's imposing, when truly they have been so, as indeed they have. Let us take our sin in our actions to ourselves; it's much more safe than to judge things so contingent, as if there were not a God that ruled the earth!

We know the Lord hath poured this nation from vessel to vessel, till He poured it into your lap, when you came first together. I am confident that it came so into your

hands, and was not judged by you to be from counterfeited or feigned necessity, but by Divine providence and dispensation. And this I speak with more earnestness, because I speak for God and not for men. I would have any man to come and tell of the transactions that have been, and of those periods of time wherein God hath made these revolutions, and find where he can fix a feigned necessity! I could recite particulars, if either my strength would serve me to speak, or yours to hear. If you would consider the great hand of God in His great dispensations, you would find that there is scarce a man who fell off, at any period of time when God had any work to do, who can give God or His work at this day a good word.

"It was," say some, "the cunning of the Lord Protector"—I take it to myself—"it was the craft of such a man and his plot that hath brought it about!" And, as they say in other countries, "There are five or six cunning men in England that have skill; they do all these things." Oh, what blasphemy is this! Because men that are without God in the world, and walk not with Him, know not what it is to pray or believe, and to receive returns from God, and to be spoken unto by the spirit of God, who speaks without a written word sometimes, yet according to it! God hath spoken heretofore in divers manners. Let Him speak as He pleaseth. Hath He not given us liberty, nay, is it not our duty, to go to the law and the testimony? And there we shall find that there *have* been impressions, in extraordinary cases, as well without the written word as with it. And therefore there is no difference in the thing thus asserted from truths generally received, except we will exclude the spirit, without whose concurrence all other teachings are ineffectual. He doth speak to the hearts and consciences of men, and leadeth them to His law and testimony, and there "also" He speaks to them, and so gives them double teachings. According to that of Job: "God speaketh once, yea twice;" and to that of David: "God hath spoken once, yea twice have I heard this." These men that live upon their *mumpsimus* and *sumpsimus*, their masses and service-books, their dead and carnal worship, no marvel if they be strangers to God, and to the works of God, and to spiritual dispensations. And because *they* say

OLIVER CROMWELL

Photogravure after an engraving

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

and believe thus, must we do so too? We, in this land, have been otherwise instructed, even by the word, and works, and spirit of God.

To say that men bring forth these things when God doth them—judge you if God will bear this! I wish that every sober heart, though he hath had temptations upon him of deserting this cause of God, yet may take heed how he provokes and falls into the hands of the Living God by such blasphemies as these! According to the tenth of the Hebrews: "If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sin." "A terrible word!" It was spoken to the Jews who, having professed Christ, apostatized from Him. What then? Nothing but a fearful "falling into the hands of the Living God!" They that shall attribute to this or that person the contrivances and production of those mighty things God hath wrought in the midst of us, and "fancy" that they have not been the revolutions of Christ Himself, "upon whose shoulders the government is laid," they speak against God, and they fall under His hand without a mediator. That is, if we deny the spirit of Jesus Christ the glory of all His works in the world, by which He rules kingdoms, and doth administer, and is the rod of His strength, we provoke the Mediator, and He may say: "I will leave you to God, I will not intercede for you; let Him tear you to pieces! I will leave thee to fall into God's hands; thou deniest me my sovereignty and power committed to me; I will not intercede nor mediate for thee; thou fallest into the hands of the Living God!" Therefore, whatsoever you may judge men for, howsoever you may say, "This is cunning, and politic, and subtle," take heed again, I say, how you judge of His revolutions as the product of men's inventions! I may be thought to press too much upon this theme. But I pray God it may stick upon your hearts and mine. The worldly-minded man knows nothing of this, but is a stranger to it; and thence his atheisms, and murmurings at instruments, yea, repining at God Himself. And no wonder, considering the Lord hath done such things amongst us as have not been known in the world these thousand years, and yet notwithstanding is not owned by us!

There is another necessity, which you have put upon us, and we have not sought. I appeal to God, angels, and men, if I shall "now" raise money according to the article in the government, whether I am not compelled to do it? Which "government" had power to call you hither, and did; and instead of seasonably providing for the army, you have labored to overthrow the government, and the army is now upon free-quarter! And you would never so much as let me hear a tittle from you concerning it. Where is the fault? Has it not been as if you had a purpose to put this extremity upon us and the nation? I hope this was not in your minds. I am willing to judge so. But such is the state into which we are reduced. By the designs of some in the army, who are now in custody, it was designed to get as many of them as possible, through discontent for want of money, the army being in a barren country, near thirty weeks behind in pay, and upon other specious pretenses, to march for England out of Scotland; and, in discontent, to seize their general there [General Monk], a faithful and honest man, that so another [Colonel Overton] might head the army. And all this opportunity taken from your delays! Whether will this be a thing of feigned necessity? What could it signify but, "The army are in discontent already, and we will make them live upon stones; we will make them cast off their governors and discipline"? What can be said to this? I list not to unsaddle myself, and put the fault upon your backs. Whether it hath been for the good of England, whilst men have been talking of this thing or the other, and pretending liberty and many good words—whether it has been as it should have been? I am confident you cannot think it has. The nation will not think so. And if the worst should be made of things, I know not what the Cornish men nor the Lincolnshire men may think, or other counties; but I believe they will all think *they are not safe*. A temporary suspension of "caring for the greatest liberties and privileges" (if it were so, which is denied) would not have been of such damage as the not providing against free-quarter hath run the nation upon. And if it be my "liberty" to walk abroad in the fields, or to take a journey, yet it is not my wisdom to do so when my house is on fire!

I have troubled you with a long speech, and I believe it may not have the same resentment with all that it hath with some. But because that is unknown to me, I shall leave it to God; and conclude with this: That I think myself bound, as in my duty to God, and to the people of these nations, for their safety and good in every respect—I think it my duty to tell you that it is not for the profit of these nations, nor for common and public good, for you to continue here any longer. And therefore I do declare unto you that I do dissolve this Parliament.

JOHN PHILPOT CURRAN

IN BEHALF OF ROWAN

[John Philpot Curran, an Irish barrister, and one of the brilliant orators of his day, was born in County Cork in 1750. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, prepared himself in London for the profession of the law, and settled down to practice in Ireland. His success was assured from the start, owing to his readiness of speech, his quickness of wit, his capacity for cross-examination, and his intimate acquaintance with the Irish character. Before many years he was chosen to the Irish House of Commons, where he spoke with effect. It became apparent, however, that his oratory was more suited to the court of law than to the public assembly. He rose steadily in general repute and importance, attaining the height of his celebrity by defenses of Archibald Hamilton Rowan, Theodore Wolf Tone, and other noted prisoners of state. He vehemently opposed the legislative union of England and Ireland. He became master of the rolls in Ireland in 1806, but the close of his life was embittered by domestic misfortunes, and he died in 1817, a melancholy and disheartened man. The first of the following speeches was made in Dublin in 1774; the second and third in the Irish parliament in 1797 and 1785, respectively.]

I KNOW no case in which a jury ought to be more severe than where personal calumny is conveyed through a vehicle which ought to be consecrated to public information; neither, on the other hand, can I conceive any case in which the firmness and the caution of a jury should be more exerted than when a subject is prosecuted for a libel on the state. The peculiarity of the British constitution (to which in its fullest extent we have an undoubted right, however distant we may be from the actual enjoyment), and in which it surpasses every known government in Europe, is this: that its only professed object is the general good, and its only foundation the general will; hence the people have a right acknowledged from time immemorial, fortified by a pile of statutes, and authenticated by a revo-

lution that speaks louder than them all, to see whether abuses have been committed, and whether their properties and their liberties have been attended to as they ought to be.

This is a kind of subject which I feel myself overawed when I approach; there are certain fundamental principles which nothing but necessity should expose to public examination; they are pillars, the depths of whose foundation you cannot explore without endangering their strength; but let it be recollected that the discussion of such topics should not be condemned in me, nor visited upon my client: the blame, if any there be, should rest only with those who have forced them into discussion. I say, therefore, it is the right of the people to keep an eternal watch upon the conduct of their rulers; and in order to do that, the freedom of the press has been cherished by the law of England. In private defamation, let it never be tolerated; in wicked and wanton aspersion upon a good and honest administration, let it never be supported. Not that a good government can be exposed to danger by groundless accusation, but because a bad government is sure to find in the detected falsehood of a licentious press a security and a credit which it could never otherwise obtain.

I said a good government cannot be endangered; I say so again, for whether it is good or bad it can never depend upon assertion; the question is decided by simple inspection: to try the tree, look at its fruit; to judge of the government, look at the people. What is the fruit of a good government? The virtue and happiness of the people. Do four millions of people in this country gather those fruits from that government, to whose injured purity, to whose spotless virtue and violated honor this seditious and atrocious libeler is to be immolated upon the altar of the constitution? To you, gentlemen of the jury, who are bound by the most sacred obligation to your country and your God, to speak nothing but the truth, I put the question, Do the people of this country gather those fruits? Are they orderly, industrious, religious, and contented? Do you find them free from bigotry and ignorance, those inseparable concomitants of systematic oppression? . . .

This paper, gentlemen, insists upon the necessity of emancipating the Catholics of Ireland, and that is charged

as a part of the libel. If they had waited another year, if they had kept this prosecution impending for another year, how much would remain for a jury to decide upon, I should be at a loss to discover. It seems as if the progress of public information was eating away the ground of the prosecution. Since the commencement of the prosecution, this part of the libel has unluckily received the sanction of the legislature. In that interval our Catholic brethren have obtained that admission, which it seems it was a libel to propose; in what way to account for this I am really at a loss. Have any alarms been occasioned by the emancipation of our Catholic brethren? Has the bigoted malignity of any individuals been crushed, or has the stability of the government, or that of the country, been weakened? Or is it one million of subjects stronger than four millions? Do you think that the benefit they received should be poisoned by the sting of vengeance? If you think so, you must say to them: "You have demanded emancipation and you have got it; but we abhor your persons, we are outraged at your success, and we will stigmatize by a criminal prosecution the adviser of that relief which you have obtained from the voice of your country." I ask you, do you think, as honest men, anxious for the public tranquillity, conscious that there are wounds not yet completely cicatrized, that you ought to speak this language at this time, to men who are too much disposed to think that in this very emancipation they have been saved from their own Parliament by the humanity of their sovereign? Or do you wish to prepare them for the revocation of these improvident concessions? Do you think it wise or humane at this moment to insult them, by sticking up in a pillory the man who dared to stand forth as their advocate? I put it to your oaths, do you think that a blessing of that kind, that a victory obtained by justice over bigotry and oppression, should have a stigma cast upon it by an ignominious sentence upon men bold and honest enough to propose that measure? To propose the redeeming of religion from the abuses of the church, the reclaiming of three millions of men from bondage, and giving liberty to all who had a right to demand it; giving, I say, in the so much censured words of this paper, giving "Universal Emancipation"!

I speak in the spirit of the British law, which makes liberty commensurate with and inseparable from British soil; which proclaims, even to the stranger and the sojourner, the moment he sets his foot upon British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation. No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced; no matter what complexion incompatible with freedom an Indian or an African sun may have burned upon him; no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down; no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery—the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain, the altar and the god sink together in the dust, his soul walks abroad in her own majesty, his body swells beyond the measure of his chains that burst from around him, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation.

[Here Mr. Curran was interrupted by a burst of applause.]

Gentlemen, I am not such a fool as to ascribe any effusion of this sort to any merits of mine. It is the mighty theme, and not the inconsiderable advocate, that can excite interest in the hearer! What you hear is but the testimony which nature bears to her own character; it is the effusion of her gratitude to that power which stamped that character upon her.

And permit me to say, that if my client had occasion to defend his cause by any mad or drunken appeals to extravagance or licentiousness, I trust in God I stand in that situation that, humble as I am, he would not have resorted to me to be his advocate. I was not recommended to his choice by any connection of principle or party, or even private friendship; and saying this, I cannot but add that I consider not to be acquainted with such a man as Mr. Rowan a want of personal good fortune. But upon this great subject of reform and emancipation there is a latitude and a boldness of remark, justifiable in the people, and necessary to the defense of Mr. Rowan, for which the habits of professional studies and technical adherence to established forms have rendered me unfit. It is, however,

my duty, standing here as his advocate, to make some few observations to you, which I conceive to be material.

Gentlemen, you are sitting in a country which has a right to the British constitution, and which is bound by an indissoluble union with the British nation. If you were now even at liberty to debate upon that subject; if you even were not by the most solemn compacts, founded upon the authority of your ancestors and of yourselves, bound to that alliance, and had an election now to make; in the present unhappy state of Europe, if you had been heretofore a stranger to Great Britain, you would now say we will enter into society and union with you:—

"Una salus ambobus erit, commune periculum."

But to accomplish that union, let me tell you, you must learn to become like the English people. It is in vain to say you will protect their freedom if you abandon your own. The pillar whose base has no foundation can give no support to the dome under which its head is placed; and if you profess to give England that assistance which you refuse to yourselves, she will laugh at your folly and despise your meanness and insincerity. Let us follow this a little further; I know you will interpret what I say with the candor in which it is spoken. England is marked by a natural avarice of freedom, which she is studious to engross and accumulate, but most unwilling to impart; whether from any necessity of her policy, or from her weakness or from her pride, I will not presume to say; but so is the fact. You need not look to the east nor to the west; you need only look to yourselves.

In order to confirm this observation, I would appeal to what fell from the learned counsel for the crown, "that notwithstanding the alliance subsisting for two centuries past between the two countries, the date of liberty in one goes no further back than the year 1784."

If it required additional confirmation, I should state the case of the invaded American and the subjugated Indian, to prove that the policy of England has ever been to govern her connections more as colonies than as allies; and it must be owing to the great spirit, indeed, of Ireland if she

shall continue free. Rely upon it, she will ever have to hold her course against an adverse current; rely upon it, if the popular spring does not continue strong and elastic, a short interval of debilitated nerve and broken force will send you down the stream again, and reconsign you to the condition of a province.

FAREWELL TO THE IRISH PARLIAMENT

I consider this as a measure of justice, with respect to the Catholics and the people at large. The Catholics in former times groaned under the malignant folly of penal laws—wandered like herds upon the earth, or gathered under some threadbare grandee who came to Dublin, danced attendance at the Castle, was smiled on by the secretary, and carried back to his miserable countrymen the gracious promise of favor and protection. They are no longer mean dependents, but owners of their country, and claiming simply and boldly, as Irishmen, the natural privileges of men and natives of their country. . . .

I now proceed to answer the objections to the measure. I was extremely shocked to see the agent of a foreign cabinet rise up in the assembly that ought to represent the Irish nation and oppose a motion that was made on the acknowledged and deplored corruption which has been imported from his country. Such an opposition is a proof of the charge, which I am astonished he could venture upon at so awful a crisis. I doubt whether the charge, or this proof of it, would appear most odious. However, I will examine the objections. It is said—"It is not the time." This argument has become a jest in Ireland, for it has been used in all times: in war, in peace, in quiet, and in disturbance. It is the miserable, dilatory plea of persevering and stupid corruption, that wishes to postpone its fate by a promise of amendment, which it is resolved never to perform. Reform has become an exception to the proverb that says there is a time for all things; but for reform there is no time, because at all times corruption is more profitable to its authors than public virtue and propriety, which

they know must be fatal to their views. As to the present time, the objections to it are a compound of the most unblushing impudence and folly. Forsooth, it would seem as if the house had yielded through fear. Personal bravery or fear are inapplicable to a public assembly. I know no cowardice so despicable as the fear of seeming to be afraid. To be afraid of danger is not an unnatural sensation; but to be brave in absurdity and injustice, merely from fear of having your sense of honesty imputed to your own apprehension, is a stretch of folly which I have never heard of before. But the time is pregnant with arguments very different indeed from those I have heard; I mean the report of the Secret Committee and the dreadful state of the country. The allegation is that the people are not to have justice, because a rebellion exists within, and because we have an enemy at our gates; because, forsooth, reform is only a pretext, and separation is the object of the leaders. If a rebellion exist, every good subject ought to be detached from it. But if an enemy threaten to invade us, it is only common sense to detach every subject from the hostile standard and bring him back to his duty and his country.

The present miserable state of Ireland—its distractions, its distresses, its bankruptcy—are the effects of the war, and it is the duty of the authors of that war to reconcile the people by the most timely and liberal justice; the utmost physical strength should be called forth, and that can be done only by union. This is a subject so tremendous I do not wish to dwell on it; I will therefore leave it. I will support a reform on its own merits, and as a measure of internal peace, at this momentous juncture. Its merits are admitted by the objection to the time, because the objection admits that at any other time it would be proper. For twenty years past there was no man of any note in England or Ireland who did not consider the necessity of it as a maxim; they all saw and confessed that the people are not represented, and that they have not the benefit of a mixed monarchy. They have a monarchy which absorbs the two other estates, and, therefore, they have the insupportable expense of a monarchy, an aristocracy, and a democracy, without the simplicity or energy of any one of those forms of government. In Ireland this is peculiarly

fatal, because the honest representation of the people is swallowed in the corruption and intrigue of a cabinet of another country. From this may be deduced the low estate of the Irish people; their honest labor is wasted in pampering their betrayers, instead of being employed, as it ought to be, in accommodating themselves and their children. On these miserable consequences of corruption, and which are all the fatal effects of inadequate representation, I do not wish to dwell. To expatiate too much on them might be unfair, but to suppress them might be treason to the public. It is said that reform is only a pretense, and that separation is the real object of leaders; if this be so, confound the leaders by destroying the pretext, and take the followers to yourselves. You say there are one hundred thousand; I firmly believe there are three times the number. So much the better for you; if these seducers can attach so many followers to rebellion by the hope of reform through blood, how much more readily will you engage them, not by the promise, but the possession, and without blood? You allude to the British fleet; learn from it to avoid the fatal consequence that may follow even a few days' delay of justice. It is said to be only a pretext; I am convinced of the contrary. I am convinced the people are sincere, and would be satisfied by it. I think so from the perseverance in petitioning for it for a number of years; I think so, because I think a monarchy, properly balanced by a fair representation of the people, gives as perfect liberty as the most celebrated republics of old. But of the real attraction of this object of reform you have a proof almost miraculous; the desire of reform has annihilated religious antipathy and united the country. In the history of mankind it is the only instance of so fatal a religious fanaticism being discarded by the good sense of mankind, instead of dying slowly by the development of its folly. And I am persuaded the hints thrown out this night to make the different sects jealous of each other will be a detected trick and will only unite them still more closely. The Catholics have given a pledge to their countrymen of their sincerity and their zeal, which cannot fail of producing the most firm reliance; they have solemnly disclaimed all idea of what is called emancipation, except as a part of that reform with-

out which their Presbyterian brethren could not be free. Reform is a necessary change of mildness for coercion. The latter has been tried; what is its success? The convention bill was passed to punish the meetings at Dungannon and those of the Catholics; the government considered the Catholic concessions as defeats that called for vengeance, and cruelly have they avenged them. But did that act, or those which followed it, put down those meetings? The contrary was the fact. It concealed them most foolishly. When popular discontents are abroad, a wise government should put them into a hive of glass. You hid them. The association at first was small; the earth seemed to drink it as a rivulet, but it only disappeared for a season. A thousand streams, through the secret windings of the earth, found their way to one course, and swelled its waters, until at last, too mighty to be contained, it burst out a great river, fertilizing by its exudations or terrifying by its cataracts. This is the effect of our penal code; it swelled sedition into rebellion. What else could be hoped from a system of terrorism? Fear is the most transient of all the passions; it is the warning that nature gives for self-preservation. But when safety is unattainable the warning must be useless, and nature does not, therefore, give it. Administration, therefore, mistook the quality of penal laws; they were sent out to abolish conventions, but they did not pass the threshold; they stood sentinels at the gates. You think that penal laws, like great dogs, will wag their tails to their masters and bark only at their enemies. You are mistaken; they turn and devour those they are meant to protect, and are harmless where they are intended to destroy.

I see gentlemen laugh; I see they are still very ignorant of the nature of fear; it cannot last; neither while it does can it be concealed. The feeble glimmering of a forced smile is a light that makes the cheek look paler. Trust me, the times are too humanized for such systems of government. Humanity will not execute them, but humanity will abhor them and those who wish to rule by such means. This is not theory; the experiment has been tried and proved. You hoped much, and, I doubt not, meant well by those laws; but they have miserably failed you; it is

time to try milder methods. You have tried to force the people; the rage of your penal laws was a storm that only drove them in groups to shelter. Your convention law gave them that organization which is justly an object of such alarm; and the very proclamation seems to have given them arms. Before it is too late, therefore, try the better force of reason, and conciliate them by justice and humanity. The period of coercion in Ireland is gone, nor can it ever return until the people shall return to the folly and to the natural weakness of disunion. Neither let us talk of innovation; the progress of nature is no innovation. The increase of people, with the growth of the mind, is no innovation; it is no way alarming unless the growth of our minds lag behind. If we think otherwise, and think it an innovation to depart from the folly of our infancy, we should come here in our swaddling-clothes; we should not innovate upon the dress, more than the understanding of the cradle. As to the system of peace now proposed, we must take it on principles; they are simply two—the abolition of religious disabilities and the representation of the people. I am confident the effects would be everything to be wished. The present alarming discontent will vanish, the good will be separated from the evil-intentioned; the friends of mixed government in Ireland are many; every sensible man must see that it gives all the enjoyment of rational liberty if the people have their due place in the state. This system would make us invincible against a foreign or domestic enemy; it would make the empire strong at this important crisis; it would restore us to liberty, industry, and peace, which I am satisfied can never, by any other means, be restored. Instead, therefore, of abusing the people, let us remember that there is no physical strength but theirs, and conciliate them by justice and reason. I am censured heavily for having acted for them in the late prosecutions. I feel no shame at such a charge, except that, at such a time as this, to defend the people should be held out as an imputation upon a king's counsel, when the people are prosecuted by the state. I think every counsel is the property of his fellow subjects. If, indeed, because I wore his majesty's gown, I had declined my duty or done it weakly or treacherously; if I had made that

gown a mantle of hypocrisy, and betrayed my client or sacrificed him to any personal view, I might, perhaps, have been thought wiser by those who have blamed me; but I should have thought myself the basest villain upon earth. The plan of peace, proposed by a reform, is the only means that I and my friends can see left to save us. It is certainly a time for decision, and not for half measures. I agree that unanimity is indispensable. The House seems pretty nearly unanimous for force; I am sorry for it, for I bode the worst from it. I will retire from a scene where I can do no good—where I certainly would interrupt that unanimity. I cannot, however, go without a parting entreaty that gentlemen will reflect on the awful responsibility in which they stand to their country and to their conscience, before they set the example to the people of abandoning the constitution and the law, and resorting to the terrible expedient of force.

ON GOVERNMENT BY ATTACHMENT

I hope I may say a few words on this great subject without disturbing the sleep of any right honorable member [the attorney-general, John Fitzgibbon, had fallen asleep on his seat], and yet, perhaps, I ought rather to envy than blame the tranquillity of the right honorable gentleman. I do not feel myself so happily tempered as to be lulled to repose by the storms that shake the land. If they invite rest to any, that rest ought not to be lavished on the guilty spirit. I never more strongly felt the necessity of a perfect union with Britain, of standing or falling with her in fortune and constitution, than on this occasion. She is the parent, the archetype of Irish liberty, which she has preserved inviolate in its grand points, while among us it has been violated and debased. I now call upon the House to consider the trust reposed in them as the great inquest of the people.

I respect judges highly. They ought to be respected, and feel their dignity and freedom from reprehension while they do what judges ought to do; but their stations should not screen them when they pass the limit of their duty. Whether they did or not is the question. This house is

the judge of those judges, and it would betray the people to tyranny and abdicate their representation if it does not act with probity and firmness.

In their proceedings against Reilly, I think they have transgressed the law, and made a precedent which, while it remains, is subversive of the trial by jury, and, of course, of liberty. I regard the constitution, I regard the judges, three of that court at least, and for their sakes I shall endeavor to undo what they have done.

The question is whether the court has really punished its own officer for a real contempt, or whether it has abused that power, for the illegal end of punishing a supposed offense against the state, by a summary proceeding without a trial by jury.

The question is plain, whether as a point of constitution or as of law; but I shall first consider it in the former view. When I feel the constitution rocking over my head, my first anxiety is to explore the foundation, to see if the great arches that support the fabric have fallen in; but I find them firm on the solid and massy principle of common law. The principle of legal liberty is that offense and trial and punishment should be fixed: it is sense; it is Magna Charta —a trial by jury as to fact; an appeal to judges as to law.

I admit attachment an exception to the general rule as founded in necessity for the support of courts, in administering justice, by a summary control over their officers acting under them; but the necessity that gave rise to it is also the limit. If it were extended further, it would reach to all criminal cases not capital; and in the room of a jury crimes would be created by a judge, the party accused by him, found guilty by him, punished by the utter loss of his liberty and property for life, by indefinite fine and imprisonment without remedy or appeal. If he did not answer, he was guilty; even if he did, the court might think, or say it thought, the answer evasive, and so convict him for imputed prevarication.

The power of attachment is wisely confined by the British laws and practised within that limit. The crown lawyers have not produced a single case where the King's Bench in England have gone beyond it. They have ranged through the annals of history, through every reign of folly and of

blood; through the proud domination of the Tudors, and the blockhead despotism of the Stuarts—without finding a single case to support their doctrine.

I consider the office of sheriff as judicial and ministerial. Reilly's offense did not fall within any summary control, in either capacity. It was not a judicial act, it was not *colore officii.* An act *colore officii* must either be an act done by the actual exercise of an abused or of a usurped authority, neither of which can it be called; for where the sheriff summons his county, he does it by command, by authority, under pain of fine and imprisonment to those who disobey.

Was the appointment of a meeting any such active exertion of authority? Does any man suppose he was obliged to attend—that he would be fined if he refused to attend? No. Did the sheriff hold out any such colorable authority? Clearly not. The contrary: he explained the purpose of the intended meeting; he stated at whose instance he appointed such meeting; and thereby showed to every man in his senses that he was not affecting to convene them by color of any compulsive authority.

If, then, there was any guilt in the sheriff's conduct, it was not punishable by attachment. They who argue from its enormity are guilty of a shabby attempt to mislead men from the question, which is not whether he ought to be punished at all, but whether he had been punished according to law.

You have heard no man adduce a single case to support their assertion; but we have the uniform practise of the King's Bench in England in our favor, the uniform practise, both there and here, during these last years. Had they not meetings there and here? Did not the crown receive petitions and addresses from such assemblies? Why, during that time, was there no motion for an attachment in either kingdom?

If an English attorney-general had attempted such a daring outrage on public liberty and law, he must have found some friend to warn him not to debase the court, and make it appear to all mankind as the odious engine of arbitrary power; not to put it into so unnatural a situation as that of standing between the people and the crown, or between the people and their representatives.

I warn him not to bring public hatred on the government by the adoption of an illegal prosecution. If he show himself afraid of proceeding against offenders by the ordinary mode, then offenders will be exalted by arbitrary persecution of them; they will become suffering patriots, from being mere petty offenders; their cries will become popular. Let him be warned how he leads the court into an illegality which the Commons can never endure. No honest representative can sacrifice his fame and his duty by voting in support of a proceeding subversive of liberty. I should shrink from the reproach of the most insignificant of my constituents if that constituent could say to me: "When thou sawest the thief of the constitution, thou consentedst unto him."

Such would be the caution suggested to an English attorney-general; and, acordingly, we find no instance of his ever venturing on such a measure.

Without case, then, or precedent, or principle, what is the support of such a conduct here? The distinction of a judge. And what is that distinction? It is different in different men; it is different in the same man at different times; it is the folly of a fool and the fear of a coward; it is the infamy of the young and the dotage of age; in the best man it is very weakness that human nature is subject to; and in the worst it is very vice. Will you, then, tell the people that you have chosen this glorious distinction in the place of fixed laws, fixed offenses, and fixed punishments, and in the place of that great barrier between the prerogative and the people—trial by jury?

But it is objected that the resolution is a censure on the judges and a charge of corruption. I deny it, and I appeal to your own acts.

[Mr. Curran then called to the clerk, who read from the journals a vote of censure passed upon Mr. Justice Robinson for imposing a fine illegally in a county, when on circuit, without view or evidence.]

Was your resolution founded on any corruption of that judge? No; you would, if so, have addressed to remove him. I called for the resolution, therefore, not to charge him with guilt—I am persuaded he acted merely through error—but to vindicate him, to vindicate you, and to exhort

you to be consistent. You thought a much smaller violation of the law was deserving your reprobation. Do not abandon yourselves and your country to slavery, by suffering so much grosser and more dangerous a transgression of the constitution to become a precedent forever. In tenderness even to the judges, interpose. Their regret, which I am sure they now feel, on reflection, cannot undo what they have done; their hands cannot wash away what is written in their records; but you may repair whatever has been injured. If your friend had unwillingly plunged a dagger into the breast of a stranger, would you prove his innocence by letting the victim bleed to death? The constitution has been wounded deeply, but, I am persuaded, innocently; it is you only who, by neglecting to interpose, can make the consequences fatal, and the wound ripen into murder.

I would wish, I own, that the liberty of Ireland should be supported by her own children; but if she be scorned and rejected by them, when her all is at stake, I will implore the assistance even of two strangers; I will call on the right honorable secretary to support the principles of the British constitution. Let him not render his administration odious to the people of Ireland by applying his influence in this house to the ruin of their personal freedom. Let him not give a pretense to the enemies of his friend in a sister country, to say that the son of the illustrious Chatham is disgracing the memory of his great father; that the trophies of his Irish administration are the introduction of an inquisition among us and the extinction of a trial by jury; let them not say that the pulse of the constitution beats only in the heart of the empire, but that it is dead in the extremities.

[Mr. Curran concluded with declaring his hearty concurrence in the resolution proposed. The attorney-general (Fitzgibbon), in a speech of much personality, opposed Curran's motion. Mr. Curran in reply:—]

I thank the right honorable gentleman for restoring me to my good humor and for having, with great liberality and parliamentary decency, answered my arguments with personality. Some expressions cannot heat me, when coming

from persons of a certain distinction. I shall not interrupt the right honorable gentleman in the fifth repetition of his speech. I shall prevent his arguments by telling him that he has not in one instance alluded to Mr. Reilly. The right honorable gentleman said I had declared the judges guilty, but I said no such thing. I said, if any judge were to act in the manner I mentioned, it would be an aggravation of his guilt. The right honorable gentleman has said that the House of Commons had no right to investigate the conduct of judges; if so, I ask the learned sergeant why he sits in that chair. I ask why the resolution has been just read from the journals. The gentleman has called me a babbler; I cannot think that was meant as a disgrace, because, in another Parliament, before I had the honor of a seat in this house, but when I was in the gallery, I heard a young lawyer named Babbler. I do not recollect that there were sponsors at the baptismal font; nor was there any occasion, as the infant had promised and vowed so many things in his own name. Indeed, I find it difficult to reply, for I am not accustomed to pronounce panegyrics on myself; I do not know well how to do it; but since I cannot tell you what I am, I shall tell you what I am not: I am not a man whose respect in person and character depends upon the importance of his office; I am not a young man who thrusts himself into the foreground of a picture which ought to be occupied by a better figure; I am not a man who replies with invective when sinking under the weight of argument; I am not a man who denied the necessity of a parliamentary reform, at the time he proved the expediency of it, by reviling his own constituents, the parish clerk, the sexton, and the grave-digger; and if there be any man who can apply what I am not to himself, I leave him to think of it in the committee and to contemplate it when he goes home.

GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS

HIS SOVEREIGNTY UNDER HIS HAT

[George William Curtis, editor, orator, and litterateur, was born at Providence, R. I., February 24, 1824. He attended school at Jamaica Plain, Mass., but at fifteen was placed in an importing house in New York city. A year later, with his elder brother, he joined the Brook Farm Community, where, as its youngest member, he stayed four years. The two years following he lived with a farmer in Concord, and in 1846 went to Europe, where he spent four years in a leisurely journey to the East. After his return he published several books of travel. His career in practical politics began in 1860, when he occupied a seat in the convention that nominated Lincoln. In 1864 he again sat in the convention, but was defeated in his candidacy for Congress. He was a delegate to the convention in 1867, called to revise the constitution of New York state, and was elected a regent of the University. He served as presidential elector for the Republicans in 1868 and in 1871, and was on the commission appointed by Grant to draw up rules regulating the civil service. At the formation of the New York State Civil Service League in 1880 he was made its president. He sat in the Republican conventions of 1880 and 1884, but at the latter bolted the nomination of Mr. Blaine and supported Mr. Cleveland during this campaign, and of 1888. He died in 1892. The first of the two ensuing speeches was made at the National Convention at Chicago, 1884; the second, before the American Social Science Association, 1881.]

GENTLEMEN: A Republican and a free man I came into this convention; by the grace of God a Republican and a free man will I go out of this convention. Twenty-four years ago I was here in Chicago. Twenty-four years ago I took part with the men of this country who nominated the man who bears the most illustrious name in the Republican party, and the brightest ray in whose halo of glory and immortality is that he was the great emancipator. In that convention, sir, a resolution was offered in amendment of the platform. It introduced into

that platform certain words from the Declaration of Independence. That man was voted down in that convention, and Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio, rose from his seat and was passing out of the convention. As he went to pass by my chair, I, well-nigh a boy and unknown to him, reached out my hand and said: "Sir, where are you going?" He said to me: "Young man, I am going out of this convention, for I find there is no place in a Republican convention for an original antislavery man like me." Well, gentlemen, after this he stopped and again took his seat, and before the convention concluded the Republican party declared no word, no deed, no sign should ever be made in a Republican convention that in the slightest degree reflected upon the honor or the loyalty of the men who took part in that convention, and upon their adhesion to liberty. The gentleman who was last upon the floor dared any one upon this floor to vote against that resolution. I say to him in reply that the presentation of such a resolution in such a convention as this is a stigma, an insult, upon every man who stands here. The question is no question at all. Precisely the same motion was brought up at the last convention, and a man from West Virginia (I honor his name) said in the face of the roaring galleries: "I am a Republican who carries his sovereignty under his own hat."

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Campbell's position in that convention agreed with the wise reflection, the afterthought, of the Republican convention of 1880, under the direction of that great leader whose face fronts us there—James A. Garfield, of Ohio. Under the lead of Garfield, I remind you, my friend from California, that convention, taking its action, induced the gentleman who presented the resolution to withdraw it from consideration. Now, sir, in the light of the character of the Republican party; in the light of the action of the last Republican convention, the first convention I have known in which such a pledge was required of the members; I ask this convention, mindful of all that hangs upon the wisdom, the moderation, the tolerance, and the patriotism of our action—mindful of it all, I beg this convention to remember Lincoln, to remember Garfield, to remember the most vital principle of the Republican party, and assume that every man here who is an honorable man

will vote this resolution down, as something which should never have appeared in a Republican convention, and as unworthy to be ratified by the concourse of free men I see before me.

ON THE SPOILS SYSTEM

Twelve years ago I read a paper before this association upon reform in the civil service. The subject was of very little interest. A few newspapers which were thought to be visionary occasionally discussed it, but the press of both parties smiled with profound indifference. Mr. Jenckes had pressed it upon an utterly listless Congress, and his proposition was regarded as the harmless hobby of an amiable man, from which a little knowledge of practical politics would soon dismount him. The English reform, which was by far the most significant political event in that country since the parliamentary reform bill of 1832, was virtually unknown to us. To the general public it was necessary to explain what the civil service was, how it was recruited, what the abuses were, and how and why they were to be remedied. Old professional politicians, who look upon reform as Dr. Johnson defined patriotism, as the last refuge of a scoundrel, either laughed at what they called the politics of idiocy and the moon, or sneered bitterly that reformers were cheap hypocrites who wanted other people's places and lamented other people's sins.

This general public indifference was not surprising. The great reaction of feeling which followed the war, the relaxation of the long-strained anxiety of the nation for its own existence, the exhaustion of the vast expenditure of life and money, and the satisfaction with the general success had left little disposition to do anything but secure in the national polity the legitimate results of the great contest. To the country, reform was a proposition to reform evils of administration of which it knew little, and which, at most, seemed to it petty and impertinent in the midst of great affairs. To Congress it was apparently a proposal to deprive members of the patronage which to many of them was the real gratification of their position, the only way in which

they felt their distinction and power. To such members reform was a plot to deprive the bear of his honey, the dog of his bone, and they stared and growled incredulously.

This was a dozen years ago. To-day the demand for reform is imperative. The drop has become a deluge. Leading journals of both parties eagerly proclaim its urgent necessity. From New England to California, public opinion is organizing itself in reform associations. In the great custom-house and the great post-office of the country—those in the city of New York—reform has been actually begun upon definite principles and with remarkable success, and the good example has been followed elsewhere with the same results. A bill carefully prepared and providing for gradual and thorough reform has been introduced with an admirable report in the Senate of the United States. Mr. Pendleton, the Democratic senator from Ohio, declares that the spoils system which has debauched the civil service of fifty millions of people must be destroyed. Mr. Dawes, the Republican senator from Massachusetts, summons all good citizens to unite to suppress this gigantic evil which threatens the Republic. Conspicuous reformers sit in the Cabinet; and in this sorrowful moment, at least, the national heart and mind and conscience, stricken and bowed by a calamity whose pathos penetrates every household in Christendom, cries to these warning words, "Amen! Amen!" Like the slight sound amid the frozen silence of the Alps that loosens and brings down the avalanche, the solitary pistol-shot of the second of July has suddenly startled this vast accumulation of public opinion into conviction, and on every side thunders the rush and roar of its overhwelming descent, which will sweep away the host of evils bred of this monstrous abuse.

This is an extraordinary change for twelve years, but it shows the vigorous political health, the alert common-sense, and the essential patriotism of the country, which are the earnest of the success of any wise reform. The war, which naturally produced the lassitude and indifference to the subject which were evident twelve years ago, had made reform, indeed, a vital necessity, but the necessity was not then perceived. The dangers that attend a vast system of administration based to its least detail upon personal patron-

age were not first exposed by Mr. Jenckes in 1867, but before that time they had been mainly discussed as possibilities and inferences. Yet the history of the old New York council of appointment had illustrated in that state the party fury and corruption which patronage necessarily breeds, and Governor McKean in Pennsylvania, at the close of the last century, had made "a clean sweep" of the places within his power. The spoils spirit struggled desperately to obtain possession of the national administration from the day of Jefferson's inauguration to that of Jackson's, when it succeeded. Its first great but undesigned triumph was the decision of the First Congress in 1789 vesting the sole power of removal in the President, a decision which placed almost every position in the civil service unconditionally at his pleasure. This decision was determined by the weight of Madison's authority. But Webster, nearly fifty years afterward, opposing his authority to that of Madison, while admitting the decision to have been final, declared it to have been wrong. The year 1820, which saw the great victory of slavery in the Missouri compromise, was also the year in which the second great triumph of the spoils system was gained, by the passage of the law which, under the plea of securing greater responsibility in certain financial offices, limited such offices to a term of four years. The decision of 1789, which gave the sole power of removal to the President, required positive executive action to effect removal; but this law of 1820 vacated all the chief financial offices, with all the places dependent upon them, during the term of every President, who, without an order of removal, could fill them all at his pleasure.

A little later a change in the method of nominating the President from a congressional caucus to a national convention still further developed the power of patronage as a party resource, and in the session of 1825–26, when John Quincy Adams was President, Mr. Benton introduced his report upon Mr. Macon's resolution declaring the necessity of reducing and regulating executive patronage; although Mr. Adams, the last of the revolutionary line of Presidents, so scorned to misuse patronage that he leaned backward in standing erect. The pressure for the overthrow of the constitutional system had grown steadily more angry and per-

emptory with the progress of the country, the development of party spirit, the increase of patronage, the unanticipated consequences of the sole executive power of removal, and the immense opportunity offered by the four years' law. It was a pressure against which Jefferson held the gates by main force, which was relaxed by the war under Madison and the fusion of parties under Monroe, but which swelled again into a furious torrent as the later parties took form. John Quincy Adams adhered, with the tough tenacity of his father's son, to the best principles of all his predecessors. He followed Washington, and observed the spirit of the Constitution in refusing to remove for any reason but official misconduct or incapacity. But he knew well what was coming, and with characteristically stinging sarcasm he called General Jackson's inaugural address "a threat of reform." With Jackson's administration in 1830 the deluge of the spoils system burst over our national politics. Sixteen years later, Mr. Buchanan said in a public speech that General Taylor would be faithless to the Whig party if he did not proscribe Democrats. So high the deluge had risen which has ravaged and wasted our politics ever since, and the danger will be stayed only when every President, leaning upon the law, shall stand fast where John Quincy Adams stood.

But the debate continued during the whole Jackson administration. In the Senate and on the stump, in elaborate reports and popular speeches, Webster, Calhoun, and Clay, the great political chiefs of their time, sought to alarm the country with the dangers of patronage. Sargent S. Prentiss, in the House of Representatives, caught up and echoed the cry under the administration of Van Buren. But the country refused to be alarmed. As the Yankee said of the Americans at the battle of White Plains, where they were beaten, "The fact is, as far as I can understand, our folks didn't seem to take no sort of interest in that battle." The reason that the country took no sort of interest in the discussion of the evils of patronage was evident. It believed the denunciation to be a mere party cry, a scream of disappointment and impotence from those who held no places and controlled no patronage. It heard the leaders of the opposition fiercely arraigning the administra-

tion for proscription and universal wrong-doing, but it was accustomed by its English tradition and descent always to hear the Tories cry that the Constitution was in danger when the Whigs were in power, and the Whigs under a Tory administration to shout that all was lost. It heard the uproar like the the old lady upon her first railroad journey, who sat serene amid the wreck of a collision, and when asked if she was much hurt, looked over her spectacles and answered blandly: "Hurt? Why, I supposed they always stopped so in this kind of traveling." The feeling that the denunciation was only a part of the game of politics, and no more to be accepted as a true statement than Snug the joiner as a true lion, was confirmed by the fact that, when the Whig opposition came into power with President Harrison, it adopted the very policy which, under Democratic administration, it had strenuously denounced as fatal. The pressure for place was even greater than it had been ten years before, and although Mr. Webster as secretary of state maintained his consistency by putting his name to an executive order asserting sound principles, the order was swept away like a lamb by a locomotive. Nothing but a miracle, said General Harrison's attorney-general, can feed the swarm of hungry office-seekers.

Adopted by both parties, Mr. Marcy's doctrine that the places in the public service are the proper spoils of a victorious party was accepted as a necessary condition of popular government. One of the highest officers of the government expounded this doctrine to me long afterward. "I believe," said he, "that when the people vote to change a party administration they vote to change every person of the opposite party who holds a place, from the President of the United States to the messenger at my door." It is this extraordinary but sincere misconception of the function of party in a free government that leads to the serious defense of the spoils system. Now, a party is merely a voluntary association of citizens to secure the enforcement of a certain policy of administration upon which they are agreed. In a free government this is done by the election of legislators and of certain executive officers who are friendly to that policy. But the duty of the great body of persons employed in the minor administrative places is in

no sense political. It is wholly ministerial, and the political opinions of such persons affect the discharge of their duties no more than their religious views or their literary preferences. All that can be justly required of such persons, in the interest of the public business, is honesty, intelligence, capacity, industry, and due subordination; and to say that, when the policy of the government is changed by the result of an election from protection to free trade, every bookkeeper and letter-carrier and messenger and porter in the public offices ought to be a free trader, is as wise as to say that if a merchant is a Baptist every clerk in his office ought to be a believer in total immersion. But the officer of whom I spoke undoubtedly expressed the general feeling. The necessarily evil consequences of the practise which he justified seemed to be still speculative and inferential, and to the national indifference which followed the war the demand of Mr. Jenckes for reform appeared to be a mere whimsical vagary most inopportunely introduced.

It was, however, soon evident that the war had made the necessity of reform imperative, and chiefly for two reasons: first, the enormous increase of patronage, and second, the fact that circumstances had largely identified a party name with patriotism. The great and radical evil of the spoils system was carefully fostered by the apparent absolute necessity to the public welfare of making political opinion and sympathy a condition of appointment to the smallest place. It is since the war, therefore, that the evil has run riot, and that its consequences have been fully revealed. Those consequences are now familiar, and I shall not describe them. It is enough that the most patriotic and intelligent Americans and the most competent foreign observers agree that the direct and logical results of that system are the dangerous confusion of the executive and legislative powers of the government; the conversion of politics into mere place-hunting; the extension of the mischief to state and county and city administration, and the consequent degradation of the national character; the practical disfranchisement of the people wherever the system is most powerful; and the perversion of a republic of equal citizens into a despotism of venal politicians. These are

the greatest dangers that can threaten a republic, and they are due to the practise of treating the vast system of minor public places which are wholly ministerial, and whose duties are the same under every party administration, not as public trusts, but as party perquisites. The English-speaking race has a grim sense of humor, and the absurdity of transacting the public business of a great nation in a way which would ruin both the trade and the character of a small huckster, of proceeding upon the theory—for such is the theory of the spoils system—that a man should be put in charge of a locomotive because he holds certain views of original sin, or because he polishes boots nimbly with his tongue—it is a folly so stupendous and grotesque that when it is fully perceived by the shrewd mother-wit of the Yankee it will be laughed indignantly and contemptuously away. But the laugh must have the method, and the indignation the form, of law; and now that the public mind is aroused to the true nature and tendency of the spoils system is the time to consider the practicable legal remedy for them.

The whole system of appointments in the civil service proceeds from the President, and in regard to his action the intention of the Constitution is indisputable. It is that the President shall appoint solely upon public considerations, and that the officer appointed shall serve as long as he discharges his duty faithfully. This is shown in Mr. Jefferson's familiar phrase in his reply to the remonstrance of the merchants of New Haven against the removal of the collector of that port. Mr. Jefferson asserted that Mr. Adams had purposely appointed in the last moments of his administration officers whose designation he should have left to his successor. Alluding to these appointments, he says: "I shall correct the procedure, and that done, return with joy to that state of things when the only question concerning a candidate shall be—Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution?" Mr. Jefferson here recognizes that these had been the considerations which had usually determined appointments; and Mr. Madison, in the debate upon the President's sole power of removal, declared that if a President should remove an officer for any reason not connected with efficient service he would be impeached. Reform, therefore, is merely a return to the principle and

purpose of the Constitution and to the practise of the early administrations.

What more is necessary, then, for reform than that the President should return to that practise? As all places in the civil service are filled either by his direct nomination or by officers whom he appoints, why has not any President ample constitutional authority to effect at any moment a complete and thorough reform? The answer is simple. He has the power. He has always had it. A President has only to do as Washington did, and all his successors have only to do likewise, and reform would be complete. Every President has but to refuse to remove non-political officers for political or personal reasons; to appoint only those whom he knows to be competent; to renominate, as Monroe and John Quincy Adams did, every faithful officer whose commission expires, and to require the heads of departments and all inferior appointing officers to conform to this practise, and the work would be done. This is apparently a short and easy and constitutional method of reform, requiring no further legislation or scheme of procedure. But why has no President adopted it? For the same reason that the best of popes does not reform the abuses of his church. For the same reason that a leaf goes over Niagara. It is because the opposing forces are overpowering. The same high officer of the government to whom I have alluded said to me as we drove upon the heights of Washington: "Do you mean that I ought not to appoint my subordinates for whom I am responsible?" I answered: "I mean that you do not appoint them now; I mean that if, when we return to the capital, you hear that your chief subordinate is dead, you will not appoint his successor. You will have to choose among the men urged upon you by certain powerful politicians. Undoubtedly you ought to appoint the man whom you believe to be the most fit. But you do not and can not. If you could or did appoint such men only, and that were the rule of your department, and of the service, there would be no need of reform." And he could not deny it. There was no law to prevent his selection of the best man. Indeed, the law assumed that he would do it. The Constitution intended that he should do it. But when I reminded him that there

were forces beyond the law that paralyzed the intention of the Constitution, and which would inevitably compel him to accept the choice of others, he said no more.

It is easy to assert that the reform of the civil service is an executive reform. So it is. But the executive alone cannot accomplish it. The abuses are now completely and aggressively organized, and the sturdiest President would quail before them. The President who should undertake, single-handed, to deal with the complication of administrative evils known as the spoils system would find his party leaders in Congress and their retainers throughout the country arrayed against him; the proposal to disregard traditions and practises which are regarded as essential to the very existence and effectiveness of party organization would be stigmatized as treachery, and the President himself would be covered with odium as a traitor. The air would hum with denunciation. The measures he should favor, the appointments he might make, the recommendations of his secretaries, would be opposed and imperiled, and the success of his administration would be endangered. A President who should alone undertake thoroughly to reform the evil must feel it to be the vital and paramount issue, and must be willing to hazard everything for its success. He must have the absolute faith and the indomitable will of Luther. "Here stand I; I can no other." How can we expect a President whom this system elects to devote himself to its destruction? General Grant, elected by a spontaneous patriotic impulse, fresh from the regulated order of military life and new to politics and politicians, saw the reason and the necessity of reform. The hero of a victorious war, at the height of his popularity, his party in undisputed and seemingly indisputable supremacy, made the attempt. Congress, good-naturedly tolerating what it considered his whim of inexperience, granted money to try an experiment. The adverse pressure was tremendous. "I am used to pressure," said the soldier. So he was, but not to this pressure. He was driven by unknown and incalculable currents. He was enveloped in whirlwinds of sophistry, scorn, and incredulity. He who upon his own line had fought it out all summer to victory, upon a line absolutely new and unknown was naturally bewildered and

dismayed. So Wellington had drawn the lines of victory on the Spanish peninsula and had saved Europe at Waterloo. But even Wellington at Waterloo could not be also Sir Robert Peel at Westminster. Even Wellington, who had overthrown Napoleon in the field, could not also be the parliamentary hero who for the welfare of his country would dare to risk the overthrow of his party. When at last President Grant said, "If Congress adjourns without positive legislation on civil service reform, I shall regard such action as a disapproval of the system and shall abandon it," it was, indeed, a surrender, but it was the surrender of a champion who had honestly mistaken both the nature and the strength of the adversary and his own power of endurance.

It is not, then, reasonable, under the conditions of our government and in the actual situation, to expect a President to go much faster or much further than public opinion. But executive action can aid most effectively the development and movement of that opinion, and the most decisive reform measures that the present administration might take would be undoubtedly supported by a powerful public sentiment. The educative results of resolute executive action, however limited and incomplete in scope, have been shown in the two great public offices of which I have spoken, the New York custom-house and the New York post-office. For nearly three years the entire practicability of reform has been demonstrated in those offices, and solely by the direction of the President. The value of such demonstrations, due to the executive will alone, carried into effect by thoroughly trained and interested subordinates, cannot be overestimated. But when they depend upon the will of a transient officer, and not upon a strong public conviction, they are seeds that have no depth of soil. A vital and enduring reform in administrative methods, although it be but a return to the constitutional intention, can be accomplished only by the commanding impulse of public opinion. Permanence is secured by law, not by individual pleasure. But in this country law is only formulated public opinion. Reform of the civil service does not contemplate an invasion of the constitutional prerogative of the President and the Senate, nor does it propose to change the Constitution by

statute. The whole system of the civil service proceeds, as I said, from the President, and the object of the reform movement is to enable him to fulfil the intention of the Constitution by revealing to him the desire of the country through the action of its authorized representatives. When the ground-swell of public opinion lifts Congress from the rocks, the President will gladly float with it into the deep water of wise and patriotic action. The President, indeed, has never been the chief sinner in the spoils system, although he has been the chief agent. Even President Jackson yielded to party pressure as much as to his own convictions. President Harrison sincerely wished to stay the flood, but it swept him away. President Grant doubtfully, and with good intentions, tested the pressure before yielding. President Hayes, with sturdy independence, adhered inflexibly to a few points, but his party chiefs cursed and derided him. President Garfield—God bless and restore him!—frankly declares permanent and effective reform to be impossible without the consent of Congress. When, therefore, Congress obeys a commanding public opinion, and reflects it in legislation, it will restore to the President the untrammeled exercise of his ample constitutional powers according to the constitutional intention; and the practical question of reform is, How shall this be brought about?

Now, it is easy to kill weeds if we can destroy their roots, and it is not difficult to determine what the principle of reform legislation should be if we can agree upon the source of the abuses to be reformed. May they not have a common origin? In fact, are they not all bound together as parts of one system? The representative in Congress, for instance, does not ask whether the interests of the public service require this removal or that appointment, but whether, directly or indirectly, either will best serve his own interests. The senator acts from the same motives. The President, in turn, balances between the personal interests of leading politicians—President, senators, and representatives all wishing to pay for personal service and to conciliate personal influence. So also the party labor required of the place-holder, the task of carrying caucuses, of defeating one man and electing another, as may be ordered, the payment of the assessment levied upon his

salary—all these are the price of the place. They are the taxes paid by him as conditions of receiving a personal favor. Thus the abuses have a common source, whatever may be the plea for the system from which they spring. Whether it be urged that the system is essential to party organization, or that the desire for place is a laudable political ambition, or that the spoils system is a logical development of our political philosophy, or that new brooms sweep clean, or that any other system is un-American—whatever the form of the plea for the abuse, the conclusion is always the same, that the minor places in the civil service are not public trusts, but rewards and prizes for personal and political favorites.

The root of the complex evil, then, is personal favoritism. This produces congressional dictation, senatorial usurpation, arbitrary removals, interference in elections, political assessments, and all the consequent corruption, degradation, and danger that experience has disclosed. The method of reform, therefore, must be a plan of selection for appointment which makes favoritism impossible. The general feeling undoubtedly is that this can be accomplished by a fixed limited term. But the terms of most of the offices to which the President and the Senate appoint, and upon which the myriad minor places in the service depend, have been fixed and limited for sixty years, yet it is during that very period that the chief evils of personal patronage have appeared. The law of 1820, which limited the term of important revenue offices to four years, and which was afterward extended to other offices, was intended, as John Quincy Adams tells us, to promote the election to the presidency of Mr. Crawford, who was then secretary of the treasury. The law was drawn by Mr. Crawford himself, and it was introduced into the Senate by one of his devoted partizans. It placed the whole body of executive financial officers at the mercy of the secretary of the treasury and of a majority of the Senate, and its design, as Mr. Adams says, "was to secure for Mr. Crawford the influence of all the incumbents in office, at the peril of displacement, and of five or ten times an equal number of ravenous office-seekers, eager to supplant them." This is the very substance of the spoils system, intentionally intro-

duced by a fixed limitation of term in place of the constitutional tenure of efficient service; and it was so far successful that it made the custom-house officers, district attorneys, marshals, registers of the land office, receivers of public money, and even paymasters in the army, notoriously active partizans of Mr. Crawford. Mr. Benton says that the four years' law merely made the dismissal of faithful officers easier, because the expiration of the term was regarded as "the creation of a vacancy to be filled by new appointments." A fixed limited term for the chief offices has not destroyed or modified personal influence, but, on the contrary, it has fostered universal servility and loss of self-respect, because reappointment depends, not upon official fidelity and efficiency, but upon personal influence and favor. To fix by law the terms of places dependent upon such offices would be like an attempt to cure hydrophobia by the bite of a mad dog. The incumbent would be always busy keeping his influence in repair to secure reappointment, and the applicant would be equally busy in seeking such influence to procure the place, and as the fixed terms would be constantly expiring, the eager and angry intrigue and contest of influence would be as endless as it is now. This certainly would not be reform.

But would not reform be secured by adding to a fixed limited term the safeguard of removal for cause only? Removal for cause alone means, of course, removal for legitimate cause, such as dishonesty, negligence, or incapacity. But who shall decide that such cause exists? This must be determined either by the responsible superior officer or by some other authority. But if left to some other authority, the right of counsel and the forms of a court would be invoked; the whole legal machinery of mandamuses, injunctions, certioraris, and the rules of evidence would be put in play to keep an incompetent clerk at his desk or a sleepy watchman on his beat. Cause for the removal of a letter-carrier in the post-office or of an accountant in the custom-house would be presented with all the pomp of impeachment and established like a high crime and misdemeanor. Thus every clerk in every office would have a kind of vested interest in his place, because, however careless, slovenly, or troublesome he might be, he could be displaced only by an

elaborate and doubtful legal process. Moreover, if the head of a bureau or a collector or a postmaster were obliged to prove negligence, or insolence, or incompetency against a clerk as he would prove theft, there would be no removals from the public service except for crimes of which the penal law takes cognizance. Consequently, removal would be always and justly regarded as a stigma upon character, and a man removed from a position in a public office would be virtually branded as a convicted criminal. Removal for cause, therefore, if the cause were to be decided by any authority but that of the responsible superior officer, instead of improving, would swiftly and enormously enhance the cost, and ruin the efficiency, of the public service, by destroying subordination, and making every lazy and worthless member of it twice as careless and incompetent as he is now.

If, then, the legitimate cause for removal ought to be determined in public as in private business, by the responsible appointing power, it is of the highest public necessity that the exercise of that power should be made as absolutely honest and independent as possible. But how can it be made honest and independent if it is not protected so far as practicable from the constant bribery of selfish interest and the illicit solicitation of personal influence? The experience of our large patronage offices proves conclusively that the cause of the larger number of removals is not dishonesty or incompetency; it is the desire to make vacancies to fill. This is the actual cause, whatever cause may be assigned. The removals would not be made except for the pressure of politicians. But those politicians would not press for removals if they could not secure the appointment of their favorites. Make it impossible for them to secure appointment, and the pressure would instantly disappear and arbitrary removal cease.

So long, therefore, as we permit minor appointments to be made by mere personal influence and favor, a fixed limited term and removal during that term for cause only would not remedy the evil, because the incumbents would still be seeking influence to secure reappointment, and the aspirants doing the same to replace them. Removal under plea of good cause would be as wanton and arbitrary as it

is now, unless the power to remove were entrusted to some other discretion than that of the superior officer, and in that case the struggle for reappointment and the knowledge that removal for the term was practically impossible would totally demoralize the service. To make sure, then, that removals shall be made for legitimate cause only, we must provide that appointment shall be made only for legitimate cause.

All roads lead to Rome. Personal influence in appointments can be annulled only by free and open competition. By that bridge we can return to the practise of Washington and to the intention of the Constitution. That is the shoe of swiftness and the magic sword by which the President can pierce and outrun the protean enemy of sophistry and tradition which prevents him from asserting his power. If you say that success in a competitive literary examination does not prove fitness to adjust customs duties, or to distribute letters, or to appraise linen, or to measure molasses, I answer that the reform does not propose that fitness shall be proved by a competitive literary examination. It proposes to annul personal influence and political favoritism by making appointment depend upon proved capacity. To determine this it proposes first to test the comparative general intelligence of all applicants and their special knowledge of the particular official duties required, and then to prove the practical faculty of the most intelligent applicants by actual trial in the performance of the duties before they are appointed. If it be still said that success in such a competition may not prove fitness, it is enough to reply that success in obtaining the favor of some kind of boss, which is the present system, presumptively proves unfitness.

Nor is it any objection to the reformed system that many efficient officers in the service could not have entered it had it been necessary to pass an examination; it is no objection, because their efficiency is a mere chance. They were not appointed because of efficiency, but either because they were diligent politicians or because they were recommended by diligent politicians. The chance of getting efficient men in any business is certainly not diminished by inquiry and investigation. I have heard an officer in the army say that he could select men from the ranks for special

duty much more satisfactorily than they could be selected by an examination. Undoubtedly he could, because he knows his men, and he selects solely by his knowledge of their comparative fitness. If this were true of the civil service, if every appointing officer chose the fittest person from those that he knew, there would be no need of reform. It is because he cannot do this that the reform is necessary.

It is the same kind of objection which alleges that competition is a droll plan by which to restore the conduct of the public business to business principles and methods, since no private business selects its agents by competition. But the managers of private business are virtually free from personal influence in selecting their subordinates, and they employ and promote and dismiss them solely for the interests of the business. Their choice, however, is determined by an actual, although not a formal competition. Like the military officer, they select those whom they know by experience to be the most competent. But if great business houses and corporations were exposed to persistent, insolent, and overpowering interference and solicitation for place such as obstructs great public departments and officers, they, too, would resort to the form of competition, as they now have its substance, and they would resort to it to secure the very freedom which they now enjoy of selecting for fitness alone.

Mr. President, in the old Arabian story, from the little box upon the seashore, carelessly opened by the fisherman, arose the towering and haughty demon, ever more monstrous and more threatening, who would not crouch again. So from the small patronage of the earlier day, from a civil service dealing with a national revenue of only $2,000,000, and regulated upon sound business principles, has sprung the un-American, un-democratic, un-republican system which destroys political independence, honor, and morality, and corrodes the national character itself. In the solemn anxiety of this hour the warning words of the austere Calhoun, uttered nearly half a century ago, echo in startled recollection like words of doom: "If you do not put this thing down, it will put you down." Happily, it is the historic faith of the race from which we are chiefly sprung that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is that

faith which has made our mother England the great parent of free states. The same faith has made America the political hope of the world. Fortunately removed by our position from the entanglements of European politics, and more united and peaceful at home than at any time within the memory of living men, the moment is most auspicious for remedying that abuse in our political system whose nature, proportions, and perils the whole country begins clearly to discern. The will and the power to apply the remedy will be a test of the sagacity and the energy of the people. The reform of which I have spoken is essentially the people's reform. With the instinct of robbers who run with the crowd and lustily cry "Stop thief!" those who would make the public service the monopoly of a few favorites denounce the determination to open that service to the whole people as a plan to establish an aristocracy. The huge ogre of patronage, gnawing at the character, the honor, and the life of the country, grimly sneers that the people cannot help themselves and that nothing can be done. But much greater things have been done. Slavery was the Giant Despair of many good men of the last generation, but slavery was overthrown. If the spoils system, a monster only less threatening than slavery, be unconquerable, it is because the country has lost its convictions, its courage, and its common sense. "I expect," said the Yankee as he surveyed a stout antagonist, "I expect that you're pretty ugly, but I cal'late I'm a darned sight uglier." I know that patronage is strong, but I believe that the American people are very much stronger.

GEORGES JACQUES DANTON

"TO DARE AGAIN, EVER TO DARE!"

[Georges Jacques Danton, a prominent member of the Convention that carried out the great French Revolution, was born in Arcis-sur-Aube in 1759. He received a good education, with a view to entering the legal profession, and while still a very young man he began the practice of law in Paris. His energies were speedily absorbed by the distracted state of public affairs, it being happily said of him that he was a born revolutionist. The first conspicuous use he made of his gift of eloquence was to urge on the mob that stormed the Bastile. He founded the order of Cordeliers, a society of radical revolutionists. By the time the so-called Legislative Assembly had gained control of public affairs, Danton was all powerful in it. When the enemies of France were marching on Paris, and the alarm ran through the city to summon volunteers to arms, Danton delivered a magnificent tirade in the Assembly. His election as deputy from Paris to the National Convention enabled Danton to give full expression of his revolutionary views. He joined the most radical group, but even he was appalled by the horrors of the Reign of Terror, as Robespierre's system of extermination was called. Danton, in consequence, was distrusted by the irreconcilable revolutionists, who determined to be rid of him. He was seized, hurried to trial, and guillotined in 1794. The first of the following speeches was delivered in the National Assembly, 1792; the second, also in the Assembly, 1793; the third, at the Convention, 1793.]

IT seems a satisfaction for the ministers of a free people to announce to them that their country will be saved. All are stirred, all are enthused, all burn to enter the combat.

You know that Verdun is not yet in the power of our enemies, and that its garrison swears to immolate the first who breathes a proposition of surrender.

One portion of our people will guard our frontiers, another will dig and arm the entrenchments, the third with pikes will defend the interior of our cities. Paris will sec-

ond these great efforts. The commissioners of the Commune will solemnly proclaim to the citizens the invitation to arm and march to the defense of the country. At such a moment you can proclaim that the capital deserves the esteem of all France. At such a moment this national assembly becomes a veritable committee of war. We ask that you concur with us in directing this sublime movement of the people, by naming commissioners to second and assist all these great measures. We ask that any one refusing to give personal service or to furnish arms shall meet the punishment of death. We ask that proper instructions be given to the citizens to direct their movements. We ask that carriers be sent to all the departments to notify them of the decrees that you proclaim here. The tocsin we shall sound is not the alarm signal of danger, it orders the charge on the enemies of France. [Applause.] To conquer we have need to dare, to dare again, ever to dare! And the safety of France is insured.

"LET FRANCE BE FREE"

The general considerations that have been presented to you are true; but at this moment it is less necessary to examine the causes of the disasters that have struck us than to apply their remedy rapidly. When the edifice is on fire, I do not join the rascals who would steal the furniture; I extinguish the flames. I tell you, therefore, you should be convinced by the despatches of Dumouriez that you have not a moment to spare in saving the republic.

Dumouriez conceived a plan which did honor to his genius. I would render him greater justice and praise than I did recently. But three months ago he announced to the executive power, your general committee of defense, that if we were not audacious enough to invade Holland in the middle of winter, to declare instantly against England the war which actually we had long been making, that we would double the difficulties of our campaign, in giving our enemies the time to deploy their forces. Since we failed to recognize this stroke of his genius, we must now repair our faults.



GEORGES JACQUES DANTON

Photogravure after an engraving

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

Dumouriez is not discouraged; he is in the middle of Holland, where he will find munitions of war; to overthrow all our enemies, he wants but Frenchmen, and France is filled with citizens. Would we be free? If we no longer desire it, let us perish, for we have all sworn it. If we wish it, let all march to defend our independence. Your enemies are making their last efforts. Pitt, recognizing he has all to lose, dares spare nothing. Take Holland, and Carthage is destroyed, and England can no longer exist but for liberty! Let Holland be conquered to liberty, and even the commercial aristocracy itself, which at the moment dominates the English people, would rise against the government which had dragged it into despotic war against a free people. They would overthrow this ministry of stupidity, who thought the methods of the *ancien régime* could smother the genius of liberty breathing in France. This ministry once overthrown in the interests of commerce, the party of liberty would show itself; for it is not dead! And if you know your duties, if your commissioners leave at once, if you extend the hand to the strangers aspiring to destroy all forms of tyranny, France is saved and the world is free.

Expedite, then, your commissioners; sustain them with your energy; let them leave this very night, this very evening.

Let them say to the opulent classes, the aristocracy of Europe must succumb to our efforts, and pay our debt, or you will have to pay it! The people have nothing but blood—they lavish it! Go, then, ingrates, and lavish your wealth! [Wild applause.] See, citizens, the fair destinies that await you. What! you have a whole nation as a lever, its reason as your fulcrum, and you have not yet upturned the world! To do this we need firmness and character; and of a truth we lack it. I put to one side all passions. They are all strangers to me save a passion for the public good.

In the most difficult situations, when the enemy was at the gates of Paris, I said to those governing: "Your discussions are shameful; I can see but the enemy. [Fresh applause.] You tire me by squabbling, in place of occupying yourselves with the safety of the republic! I repudiate you all as traitors to our country! I place you all in the

same line!" I said to them: "What care I for my reputation? Let France be free, though my name were accursed!" What care I that I am called "a blood-drinker"? Well, let us drink the blood of the enemies of humanity, if needful; but let us struggle, let us achieve freedom. Some fear the departure of the commissioners may weaken one or the other section of this convention. Vain fears! Carry your energy everywhere. The pleasantest declaration will be to announce to the people that the terrible debt weighing upon them will be wrested from their enemies or that the rich will shortly have to pay it. The national situation is cruel. The representatives of value are no longer in equilibrium in the circulation. The day of the working man is lengthened beyond necessity. A great corrective measure is necessary! Conquerors of Holland, reanimate in England the republican party; let us advance France, and we shall go glorified to posterity. Achieve these grand destinies: no more debates, no more quarrels, and the fatherland is saved.

"SQUEEZING THE SPONGE"

You have decreed "honorable mention" of what has been done for the public benefit by the Department De L'Hevault. In this decree you authorize the whole republic to adopt the same measures, for your decree ratifies all the acts which have just been brought to your knowledge.

If everywhere the same measures be taken, the republic is saved. No more shall we treat as agitators and anarchists the ardent friends of liberty who set the nation in motion, but we shall say: "Honor to the agitators who turn the vigor of the people against its enemies!" When the Temple of Liberty shall be reared, the people will know how to decorate it. Rather perish France than to return to our hard slavery. Let it not be believed we shall become barbarians after we shall have founded liberty. We shall embellish France until the despots shall envy us; but while the ship of state is in the stress of storm, beaten by the tempest, that which belongs to each belongs to all.

No longer are agrarian laws spoken of! The people are

wiser than their calumniators assumed, and the people in mass have much more sense than many of those who deem themselves great men. In a people we can no more count the great men than we can count the giant trees in the vast forest. It was believed that the people wanted the agrarian law, and this may throw suspicion on the measures adopted by the Department De L'Hevault. It will be said of them: "They taxed the rich"; but, citizens, to tax the rich is to serve them. It is rather a veritable advantage for them than any considerable sacrifice; and the greater the sarcifice the greater the usufruct, for the greater is the guaranty to the foundation of property against the invasion of its enemies. It is an appeal to every man, according to his means, to save the republic. The appeal is just. What the Department De L'Hevault has done, Paris and all France will do. See what resources France will procure. Paris has a luxury and wealth which is considerable. Well, by decree, this sponge will be squeezed! And with singular satisfaction it will be found that the people will conduct their revolution at the expense of their internal enemies. These enemies themselves will learn the price of liberty and will desire to possess it, when they will recognize that it has preserved for them their possessions.

Paris in making an appeal to capitalists will furnish her contingent, which will afford means to suppress the troubles in La Vendée; for, at any sacrifice, these troubles must be suppressed. On this alone depends your external tranquillity. Already the departments of the north have informed the combined despots that your territory cannot be divided; and soon you will probably learn of the dissolution of this formidable league of kings. For in uniting against you, they have not forgotten their ancient hatreds and respective pretensions; and if the executive council had had a little more latitude, the league might be already completely dissolved.

Paris, then, must be directed against La Vendée. All the men needed in this city to form a reserve camp should be sent at once to La Vendée. These measures once taken, the rebels will disperse, and, like the Austrians, will commence to kill each other. If the flames of this civil discord be extinguished, they will ask of us peace!

CUSHMAN KELLOGG DAVIS

THE UNITED STATES IN HAWAII

[Cushman Kellogg Davis, an American statesman, was born in New York state in 1838. He was taken to the West in early life by his parents and "grew up with the country," getting his education in the academy of a Wisconsin town, and finishing it with a course at the University of Michigan. Then he settled down as a Wisconsin lawyer; but the Civil War came, and he raised a company and went to the front. He attained the rank of adjutant-general, and was forced by an attack of fever in 1864 to leave the army. Establishing himself as a lawyer in St. Paul, he was elected to the Minnesota Legislature, and subsequently held local offices until in 1873 he was chosen governor of Minnesota. His political affiliations were Republican. Having been more than once an unsuccessful candidate, he was at last elected to the United States Senate in 1887, and was reëlected in 1893, and again in 1899. His senatorial career was exceedingly conspicuous, making him a prominent figure before the country, especially upon his admission to the famous Committee on Foreign Relations. He reported to the Senate the resolution that was tantamount to a declaration of war with Spain, and in August of 1898 he was placed upon the peace commission that went to Paris to draft the treaty of amity. He died in 1900. This speech, giving his reasons for thinking the annexation of Hawaii to the United States a wise political movement, was made in the Senate in 1892.]

THUS, Mr. President, the curtain fell upon the last scene of this harlequin monarchy. The stage lords and stage ladies vanished into the mass of the population. The queen of the play laid aside her tinsel crown, put off her tawdry regalia, and reentered private life through the stage entrance. The play had had its run. The engagement, which had not been successful, was ended, and the theater was to be closed. The whole proceeding throughout had been imitative. The monarchy was a spectacle. It had been tolerated by the civilized world, although fre-

quently the performance had been rudely and forcibly interrupted by the foreign spectators. The domestic audience, heavily taxed for its support, when insulted by the actors had repeatedly resented the indignity with violence. The practical and real took the place of this pernicious mockery. A firm government, conducted by just and able men, was installed upon the abandoned stage. The whole proceeding had been spectacular. Civilization had endured it. The lord of the demesne had for a brief period conferred his functions upon Christopher Sly. But to this general and correct appreciation of the melodrama there was one exception. As the play was ending, the Democratic administration came in as a spectator, as Don Quixote and Sancho Panza entered the puppet show in Spain. To it, as to the Don, the performance was real, and, like real life, it was thought to be continuous. It saw in the mammets and puppets and in the stage queen weakness overpowered and virginity oppressed and disinherited, while Sancho, against the evidence of his senses, saw through the eyes of his master. [Laughter and applause in the galleries.]

Mr. Blount was appointed on the eleventh day of March 1893. The treaty was withdrawn, I think, upon the seventh day of March 1893. An inquiry more interesting and important than anything I have discussed (because this Hawaiian question is fleeting; it will pass away) is whether the appointment of Mr. Blount was a constitutional appointment, in that it never received the advice or consent of the Senate.

Mr. Blount was appointed on the eleventh day of March 1893, and he arrived at Honolulu on the twenty-ninth day of April 1893. He called on President Dole and presented the letters of credence to that "great and good brother" on the thirtieth day of April 1893.

"I communicated to him the friendly disposition of our government toward him and toward the Hawaiian people. I assured him of its purpose to avoid any interference with the domestic concerns of the islands, unless it became necessary to protect the persons and property of American citizens. I then offered my letters of credence."

Now in the light of what he did immediately thereafter, and what has been done since, the proprieties of language

fail to properly characterize that delusive message; for he immediately proceeded, in violation of a statute of his country, which no President can dispense with, and of the precepts of international law, to put himself into communication (as he wrongfully charges Stevens with doing) with an element—to wit, the royal element—which is in every way hostile to the government to which he had just presented his letters of credence, and in which he assured it of the entire friendship of the President of the United States. I refer to section 1751 of the Revised Statutes.

"No diplomatic or consular officer shall correspond, in regard to the public affairs of any foreign government, with any private person, newspaper or other periodical, or otherwise than with the proper officers of the United States."

Over and over again Mr. Blount violated that provision.

Mr. Hawley—He was sent to do nothing else.

Mr. Davis—The instructions he received were not the message which he communicated to President Dole. Those were concealed.

On the thirtieth day of March it had got out in Hawaii that Mr. Blount was there. The hopes of royalty in some way or other were excited, and a mass meeting of the Hawaiian League was held. It passed resolutions for the restoration of the monarchy and the restoration of Queen Liliuokalani, reciting that President Cleveland had sent Mr. Blount out as special commissioner. This was the next day after he had arrived in the island. On the next day, March 31, he received a messenger wishing to know whether it would be convenient for him to receive a committee from the mass meeting which desired to present these resolutions. If this was not corresponding with, putting himself into communication with private persons, subjects of another power, within the prohibition of the statute which I have read, will some one tell me what would be? He avows that this raised a question whether such action would consist with a "recognition of existing authority and the policy of non-interference (page 6)." But he does not avow any intention of consulting President Dole on this point, nor did he consult him.

But something had to be done to smooth away the road

to the audience which he proposed to give in his court to the committee of the mass meeting which was about to invoke him to aid in restoring the fallen monarchy. The American flag was floating over the government building of Hawaii at that time. It was invited to float over there by Mr. Dole's government, which we had recognized. There was no question of forcible intervention or intrusion there at all. It was properly there by the invitation of the government of President Dole, which was the only government that had any right to complain. To make the way smooth and easy to receive this petition for the restoration of the royal power, with the inevitable effect of its raising hopes which were in direct contradiction to the assurances he had given to President Dole two days before, or one day before, on the thirty-first day of March 1893 he called on Mr. Dole and notified him that he, Mr. Blount, should cause the ensign of the United States to be lowered and the troops to execute such order on the first day of April, at eleven o'clock. The flag was rightfully there. The annexation of the islands was thought to be imminent. The flag was the coming event which cast its shadow before. It was there by invitation of the provisional government itself. It was there under the stress of urgent and imminent danger, as appeared both to President Dole and Mr. Stevens when such request was made.

Mr. President, this is the first time in nearly thirty years that the American flag has been lowered by an American hand under circumstances which have brought a feeling of dishonor and shame to an American heart. It is the last time in many years, I predict, that that act will be done. Although the stars thus disappeared from the Hawaiian sky, that ensign will in due time, though lowered in dishonor, eventually be raised in power.

After these orders were delivered to Admiral Skerrett, and when everything was made easy for aspiring royalism by the announcement that it was to be done (for it went out that the American flag was to be lowered and the military recalled on board the ship), Mr. Blount, in the afternoon of that day, March 31, notified the committee of the league that he would receive them at four o'clock, April 1, five hours after the American flag was to be lowered.

What was the effect of that? All that Stevens is charged with doing by way of inciting rebellion and revolution or tumult is not the tithe of a thousandth part of that which can be inferred from the actions of Mr. Blount. When Mr. Blount came to the island, everything was serene and peaceful. Everybody had acquiesced, the queen included, in the situation. He had not been there two days before, by an act a thousand times more significant than anything even Stevens is charged with, he incited all of the trouble, the rebellious feeling, the insurrectionary disposition, which for a time seemed to have been laid at rest; and then, under those circumstances, he notified the committee of the league (which, I think, he says somewhere in his report comprised eight thousand native Hawaiians) that, the flag being out of the way, the troops off the island, "I here, a special commissioner, am ready to receive you," and he says in regard to lowering the flag:—

"This was done in order that, when the committee called, the ensign would have been hauled down and the troops ordered aboard of their vessels, and I could state freely to the committee that it was not my purpose to interfere in their domestic concerns; that United States troops would not be used to maintain or restore any form of government, but simply to protect the persons and property of American citizens."

But the flag that he struck was there at the request of the provisional government, which our government had recognized and to which he had been accredited. He met this committee—nineteen members. They presented to him resolutions, desiring that they be transmitted to the President of the United States.

Mr. Morgan—Will the senator from Minnesota allow me to ask him a question? If he has it before him, I wish he would point out the request made by the provisional government for the putting up of the flag.

Mr. Davis—It is in one of the documents submitted by the President to the Senate within a few days. It is in a despatch from Mr. Stevens to Mr. Gresham, wherein he goes on at length reciting the apprehended intrigue of the British commissioner, the presence of the additional Japanese men-of-war, a translation of declarations of the Japanese

captain, the wish and desire of President Dole that the marines should be landed gave in short, giving a full and explicit reason for their presence there. Now, I cannot give the page, and it is asking too much in the manner in which I am speaking to request it.

So much for the interview which Mr. Blount had with the members of the league within two days after he landed on the island, praying for the restoration of the monarchy and the deposition of the government to which he was accredited. Shortly afterward he received a long petition from the Hawaiian political league, another affair, it seems, numerously signed, which states:—

"Therefore, we submit to you our humble petition and statements, as you are in possession of vast powers in your mission to do justice to the Hawaiian people, our independence, the throne, and the Hawaiian flag; we beg you to restore our beloved Queen Liliuokalani to the throne, with the independence of the Hawaiian people, as you have restored the Hawaiian flag."

That no United States minister should correspond with any private citizen is the plainest dictate of international law, if it were not against the plain provision of our statute. About the twenty-sixth of April (in this case he notified Commissioner Dole of his intention) he called upon Queen Liliuokalani and took her statement, negotiated with her upon the subject, took her version of the transaction and her claims. But, as I have said, he made no attempt to take the version of Mr. Stevens or Mr. Dole. On the thirty-first of May he did another extraordinary act. Accredited to the provisional government as lord paramount in all matters concerning the political relations between the two countries, he placed himself in correspondence with the queen in her royal character, and with her cabinet in their official capacity; received petitions in that character and in that capacity from the queen as queen, from Samuel Parker as minister of foreign affairs, W. H. Cornell as minister of finance, John F. Colburn as minister of the interior, and A. P. Peterson as attorney-general. It thus concludes:—

"In view of the facts stated above, which cannot be controverted, and in view of the fact that your investigations concerning the matter

are shortly likely to terminate, we, Liliuokalani and her cabinet, who formed the government of the Hawaiian Islands on the seventeenth of January last, having surrendered that government to the superior force of the United States of America, now most respectfully ask that you use your good offices in undoing the acts of a representative of your country and place the government of the Hawaiian Islands as Mr. Stevens found them. Believing that the principle of justice which has ever dominated American action will prevail in this instance, we remain,

"Yours respectfully,

"LILIUOKALANI, R.

"SAMUEL PARKER, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"W. H. CORNELL, Minister of Finance.

"JOHN F. COLBURN, Minister of the Interior.

"A. P. PETERSON, Attorney-General."

Accredited to President Dole, with letters which bore assurances of good faith, and, if I construe the language correctly, an implied wish for the stability and perpetuity of the government over which Mr. Dole presided, Commissioner Blount entered into diplomatic relations with the deposed queen, she signing her name in royal form and in her royal capacity and her former ministers countersigning in their official capacity, received a petition from her and them in her royal capacity and their official capacity, requesting him to use his good offices to overthrow the government to which he had been accredited—the government of Americans, of Englishmen, of our own blood, presided over by a man of American birth or derivation—and to turn those vast interests, these our kith and kin, over to the barbarous and revengeful administration of a government which had been successfully rebelled against and overthrown. A more glaring diplomatic malversation never was committed; and that it is plainly in violation of the statute which I have read in the hearing of the Senate cannot, I think, be controverted for a moment.

And upon this testimony, this history, these transactions, the President of the United States in his annual message states that Mr. Blount's report shows his conclusions to be true beyond all question. He states that the constitutional government of Hawaii had been subverted through the active aid of the representative of our govern-

ment, and through the intimidation caused by the presence of an armed naval force of the United States, which was landed for the purpose at the instance of our minister. His conclusion is:—

"Upon the facts developed it seemed to me the only honorable course for our government to pursue was to undo the wrong that had been done by those representing us, and to restore as far as practicable the status existing at the time of our forcible intervention. With a view of accomplishing this result within the constitutional limits of executive power, and recognizing all our obligations and responsibilities growing out of any changed conditions brought about by our unjustifiable interference, our present minister at Honolulu has received appropriate instructions to that end. Thus far no information of the accomplishment of any definite results has been received from him."

Now, Mr. President, I desire to ascertain and to discuss for a moment from what source the President of the United States derived his authority to arbitrate this great question. Who made him and by what processes did he become the judge of the case between an overthrown monarchy and a republic which took its place? Much has been said about the terms of Queen Liliuokalani's abdication, but when did any falling monarch ever fail to file a caveat with contemporaries and posterity to that effect? It is addressed to no person. It was never formally accepted by anybody, and no convention has ever been made between the Hawaiian government, which Mr. Cleveland, following the example of President Harrison, has recognized, or the former government of the queen and ourselves, that such an arbitration shall take place. But there is a consideration back of all this, and back of anything I have said upon this subject, which to me is decisive. What the queen of the Hawaiian kingdom meant and understood to be meant in the letter of abdication was that a question of recognition was to be submitted to the United States; and I assert it as a sound legal proposition, in view and in the light of all the circumstances of this transaction, that the very question which the President of the United States has reopened here was settled when President Harrison recognized the provisional government. The act of recognition is all-comprehending, so far as bringing a nation into existence. It is a deliberate

judgment by the recognizing nation that the recognized government has a valid right to be, has come into being rightfully, and has the right to continue. It is in its very nature an irrevocable act. Who ever heard of any civilized country retracting any recognition which it had given to a foreign country? Like an executed grant, it is incapable of revocation, because the right has vested and cannot be taken away.

Queen Liliuokalani's protest was received at the State Department on the third day of February 1893, and the treaty, I think, was not concluded until the thirteenth day of that month. Her representative was here at the time. The case was heard and determined, and wisely determined, by President Harrison, and it does not lie in the capacity of any succeeding administration to open it for readjudication. And the queen passively acquiesced in that construction of her act of abdication, and in the conclusive effect of President Harrison's recognition of the provisional government, until she was enticed to renew her claim by the action of the present administration.

Mr. President, it has seemed to become a propensity to restore royalty—ignorant, savage, alien royalty—over American people. But in these days of restoring monarchies, suppose the President of the United States shall conceive that President Harrison has been imposed upon, misled, by the recognition of President Peixoto, who succeeded to the fallen empire of Dom Pedro in Brazil. The recognition in this case was prompt. Suppose the President should determine to reopen the question and to send a minister there to stand before President Peixoto and say: "I have become satisfied that my predecessor was misled, that your government was not established with the consent of the Brazilian people, and therefore you are required to relinquish your power to the lineal descendant and heir of Dom Pedro, whoever he may be."

If this power exists in the President of the United States, it exists in the successive Presidents to undo the act of the President who has recognized another government. The same thing might be done to President Carnot; it might have been done to President Thiers, who was the first president of the now-existing French republic. Sup-

pose the President of the United States should take it into his head that the French republic was wrongfully established, and not with the consent of the French people, and a paramount emissary, emissary at once and ambassador, should be sent to France, accredited to "his great and good friend," President Carnot, with authority over our army and navy, and that France were in distress, and that as an emissary he should consort with Bourbons, with Orleanists, with Bonapartists, with anarchists, with every political element of which French political complexion is composed. Suppose that when, having so consorted as an emissary, without giving those to whom he was accredited a chance to be heard, he should stand forth as an ambassador before the French President, and say: "The President of the United States is convinced that the French republic was not established with the consent of the French people; a great wrong has been done. Therefore you are required to relinquish the republican power which you now hold to the emperor of the Bonaparte family, or the king of the French, whoever he may be, of the other royal houses in the line of lineal descent."

Mr. President, many questions and illustrations of this kind press upon the mind while one is speaking, but the limitations of time do not warrant more extended remarks. They suggest themselves. It is said we do not want colonies, and that we do not need the Hawaiian Islands. I am not in favor of a colonial system such as Great Britain has, and such as France is striving for; but I want to see my country well defended, and her hold upon the enormous commerce of the future in the Pacific Ocean assured. That the Sandwich Islands were in time to be an indispensable element of the prosperity, protection, and defense of our country has been a cardinal theory with every statesman who ever sat in the chair of the secretary of state from the beginning of the question down to the present time, the present occupant excepted.

Humboldt predicted seventy years ago that the greatest maritime commerce of the planet would be carried on on the Pacific. If you take the globe and look north of the equator, and then to the south of it, you will see that the islands of the Pacific Ocean, except the Sandwich Islands

and the Alaskan group, are south of the equator. Germany, France, and England have partitioned that archipelago south of the equator. They have hitherto kept their hands off the Hawaiian Islands. Those are the only islands of any importance north of the equator until we almost touch the coast of Asia, except the Alaskan group. They stand where commerce from the Nicaragua Canal, if it should ever be constructed, must touch. They stand where ships from Callao and Valparaiso must touch. They stand where the ship that goes from San Francisco or Victoria to New Zealand or Australia must touch. They are 2,100 miles from the city of San Francisco. They are 2,100 miles from the midway island of the Alaskan group, an island with capacious harbors fit for a naval station. The Russian Government, our ancient and immemorial friend, is building a railway across the continent of Asia destined for a port near by; and her relations and ours have always been such that, under these circumstances, from the Hawaiian Islands, from the Alaskan Islands, from San Francisco, we can make our commerce safe and dominate the waste of waters. That is the kind of acquisition and the kind of protection I want for my country, its future, and its commerce.

Mr. President, this is a great question—great in its facts, great in its constitutional aspect. The American people will be the judges in this controversy. They are adjudicating it now. In the midst of distress, of financial disorder, which the panacea of legislative action has not cured; with the mine sterile, the shuttle motionless, the wheel still, the factory sending up neither pillar of cloud by day nor pillar of fire by night; with hunger and cold in thousands of homes; with the fear of a relentless party policy respecting financial and economic legislation which threatens to intensify all this distress into a deeper agony, the American people have paused to consider this subject, and they will settle it in the sublime tribunal of the nation's judgment. [Applause.]

JEFFERSON DAVIS

ON WITHDRAWAL FROM THE UNION

[Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States of America, was born in Kentucky in 1808. He entered Transylvania College in Kentucky, but left in his senior year to accept an appointment in 1824 to West Point. From here he graduated in 1828, and with the rank of lieutenant served on the northwestern frontier until 1833. From 1833 to 1835 he was engaged in campaigns against the Indians. He entered political life in 1843, advocating the principles of the Democratic party, was made presidential elector the next year, and a member of Congress in 1845. He sat in the Senate from 1847 to 1851 ; became Secretary of War in the cabinet of Franklin Pierce in 1853, and returned to the Senate at the close of the administration, retaining his seat therein until the twenty-first of January, when Mississippi declared her intention to separate from the United States. Being the exponent of the extreme doctrines of states' rights and secession, he was turned to as the guiding spirit in the new government to be formed by the six seceding states. At the convention meeting at Montgomery, Ala., February 9, 1861, he was elected president, having the year previous been chosen provisional president. After the surrender of Lee's army he was apprehended at Irvingsville, Ga., May 10, 1865, and imprisoned at Fortress Monroe for two years. He was released on bail furnished by Horace Greeley, then editor of the New York Tribune, but was not tried for treason, being included in the general amnesty proclamation of 1868. After his release he wrote a " History of the Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government," but never again accepted a political office. He died in New Orleans, December 6, 1889. The following speech, announcing the resolution of Mississippi to withdraw from the Union, was made in the Senate in 1861, shortly before the Civil War began.]

I RISE, Mr. President, for the purpose of announcing to the Senate that I have satisfactory evidence that the State of Mississippi, by a solemn ordinance of her people in convention assembled, has declared her separation from the United States. Under these circumstances, of course

my functions are terminated here. It has seemed to me proper, however, that I should appear in the Senate to announce that fact to my associates, and I will say but very little more. The occasion does not invite me to go into argument, and my physical condition would not permit me to do so if it were otherwise; and yet it seems to become me to say something on the part of the state I here represent, on an occasion so solemn as this.

It is known to senators who have served with me here that I have for many years advocated, as an essential attribute of state sovereignty, the right of a state to secede from the Union. Therefore, if I had not believed there was justifiable cause; if I had thought that Mississippi was acting without sufficient provocation, or without an existing necessity, I should still, under my theory of the government, because of my allegiance to the state of which I am a citizen, have been bound by her action. I, however, may be permitted to say that I do think that she has justifiable cause, and I approve of her act. I conferred with her people before that act was taken, counseled them then that, if the state of things which they apprehended should exist when the convention met, they should take the action which they have now adopted.

I hope none who hear me will confound this expression of mine with the advocacy of the right of a state to remain in the Union, and to disregard its constitutional obligations by the nullification of the law. Such is not my theory. Nullification and secession, so often confounded, are indeed antagonistic principles. Nullification is a remedy which it is sought to apply within the Union, and against the agent of the states. It is only to be justified when the agent has violated his constitutional obligation, and a state, assuming to judge for itself, denies the right of the agent thus to act, and appeals to the other states of the Union for a decision; but when the states themselves, and when the people of the states, have so acted as to convince us that they will not regard our constitutional rights, then, and then for the first time, arises the doctrine of secession in its practical application.

A great man who now reposes with his fathers, and who has been often arraigned for a want of fealty to the Union,

advocated the doctrine of nullification, because it preserved the Union. It was because of his deep-seated attachment to the Union, his determination to find some remedy for existing ills short of a severance of the ties which bound South Carolina to the other states, that Mr. Calhoun advocated the doctrine of nullification, which he proclaimed to be peaceful, to be within the limits of state power, not to disturb the Union, but only to be a means of bringing the agent before the tribunal of the states for their judgment.

Secession belongs to a different class of remedies. It is to be justified upon the basis that the states are sovereign. There was a time when none denied it. I hope the time may come again, when a better comprehension of the theory of our government, and the inalienable rights of the people of the states, will prevent any one from denying that each state is a sovereign, and thus may reclaim the grants which it has made to any agent whomsoever.

I therefore say I concur in the action of the people of Mississippi, believing it to be necessary and proper, and should have been bound by their action if my belief had been otherwise; and this brings me to the important point which I wish on this last occasion to present to the Senate. It is by this confounding of nullification and secession that the name of the great man whose ashes now mingle with his mother earth has been invoked to justify coercion against a seceded state. The phrase "to execute the laws" was an expression which General Jackson applied to the case of a state refusing to obey the laws while yet a member of the Union. That is not the case which is now presented. The laws are to be executed over the United States, and upon the people of the United States. They have no relation to any foreign country. It is a perversion of terms, at least it is a great misapprehension of the case, which cites that expression for application to a state which has withdrawn from the Union. You may make war on a foreign state. If it be the purpose of gentlemen, they may make war against a state which has withdrawn from the Union; but there are no laws of the United States to be executed within the limits of a seceded state. A state finding herself in the condition in which Mississippi has judged she is, in which her safety requires that she should provide for the

maintenance of her rights out of the Union, surrenders all the benefits (and they are known to be many), deprives herself of the advantages (they are known to be great), severs all the ties of affection (and they are close and enduring), which have bound her to the Union; and thus divesting herself of every benefit, taking upon herself every burden, she claims to be exempt from any power to execute the laws of the United States within her limits.

I well remember an occasion when Massachusetts was arraigned before the bar of the Senate, and when then the doctrine of coercion was rife and to be applied against her because of the rescue of a fugitive slave in Boston. My opinion then was the same that it is now. Not in a spirit of egotism, but to show that I am not influenced in my opinion because the case is my own, I refer to that time and that occasion as containing the opinion which I then entertained, and on which my present conduct is based. I then said, if Massachusetts, following her through a stated line of conduct, chooses to take the last step which separates her from the Union, it is her right to go, and I will neither vote one dollar nor one man to coerce her back, but will say to her, God speed, in memory of the kind associations which once existed between her and the other states.

It has been a conviction of pressing necessity, it has been a belief that we are to be deprived in the Union of the rights which our fathers bequeathed to us, which has brought Mississippi into her present decision. She has heard proclaimed the theory that all men are created free and equal, and this made the basis of an attack upon her social institutions; and the sacred Declaration of Independence has been invoked to maintain the position of the equality of the races. That Declaration of Independence is to be construed by the circumstances and purposes for which it was made. The communities were declaring their independence; the people of those communities were asserting that no man was born—to use the language of Mr. Jefferson—booted and spurred to ride over the rest of mankind; that men were created equal—meaning the men of the political community; that there was no divine right to rule; that no man inherited the right to govern; that there were no classes by which power and place descended to families,

JEFFERSON DAVIS

Photogravure after an engraving by Sartain


THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

but that all stations were equally within the grasp of each member of the body politic. These were the great principles they announced; these were the purposes for which they made their declaration; these were the end to which their enunciation was directed. They have no reference to the slave; else, how happened it that among the items of arraignment made against George III. was that he endeavored to do just what the North had been endeavoring of late to do—to stir up insurrection among our slaves? Had the Declaration announced that the negroes were free and equal, how was the prince to be arraigned for stirring up insurrection among them? And how was this to be enumerated among the high crimes which caused the colonies to sever their connection with the mother country? When our Constitution was formed, the same idea was rendered more palpable, for there we find provision made for that very class of persons as property; they were not put upon the footing of equality with white men—not even upon that of paupers and convicts; but, so far as representation was concerned, were discrimnated against as a lower caste, only to be represented in the numerical proportion of three-fifths.

Then, senators, we recur to the compact which binds us together; we recur to the principles upon which our government was founded; and when you deny them, and when you deny to us the right to withdraw from a government which, thus perverted, threatens to be destructive of our rights, we but tread in the path of our fathers when we proclaim our independence, and take the hazard. This is done not in hostility to others, not to injure any section of the country, not even for our own pecuniary benefit; but from the high and solemn motive of defending and protecting the rights we inherited, and which it is our sacred duty to transmit unshorn to our children.

I find in myself, perhaps, a type of the general feeling of my constituents toward yours. I am sure I feel no hostility to you, senators from the North. I am sure there is not one of you, whatever sharp discussion there may have been between us, to whom I cannot now say, in the presence of my God, I wish you well; and such, I am sure, is the feeling of the people whom I represent toward those whom you represent. I therefore feel that I but express

their desire when I say I hope, and they hope, for peaceful relations with you, though we must part. They may be mutually beneficial to us in the future, as they have been in the past, if you so will it. The reverse may bring disaster on every portion of the country; and if you will have it thus, we will invoke the God of our fathers, who delivered them from the power of the lion, to protect us from the ravages of the bear; and thus, putting our trust in God, and in our own firm hearts and strong arms, we will vindicate the right as best we may.

In the course of my service here, associated at different times with a great variety of senators, I see now around me some with whom I have served long; there have been points of collision; but whatever of offense there has been to me, I leave here; I carry with me no hostile remembrance. Whatever offense I have given which has not been redressed, or for which satisfaction has not been demanded, I have, senators, in this hour of our parting, to offer you my apology for any pain which, in heat of discussion, I have inflicted. I go hence unencumbered of the remembrance of any injury received, and having discharged the duty of making the only reparation in my power for any injury offered.

Mr. President and senators, having made the announcement which the occasion seemed to me to require, it only remains for me to bid you a final adieu.

DEMOSTHENES

"ON THE CROWN"

[Demosthenes, the greatest orator of ancient Greece, the tireless denouncer of Philip of Macedon, was born some time between 382 and 384 B.C. He had good teachers in his youth, though his guardians failed to pay them. Oratory had been his choice from a very early age. He had, however, nearly every physical disability standing in the way of success. Withdrawing into seclusion, he corrected such defects as would yield to persistent effort. In 355 B.C. he entered upon his public career as an orator, and made it his principal endeavor to save the liberties of Greece by inveighing against her subtlest and strongest enemy, Philip of Macedon. His most famous orations, the "Philippics," directed against this enemy, were delivered between 351 and 341 B.C. In 338 the crisis came; and the battle of Chæronea brought defeat to the allied Theban and Athenian forces. Athens, though humbled, did not forget the man who had struggled to preserve her liberties. In 336 B.C., Ctesiphon moved in the Senate to present a gift of a golden crown to Demosthenes, but Æschines, a rival orator, opposed the motion, and gave notice that he would bring suit against Ctesiphon for proposing an illegal measure. The trial was delayed seven years, but when it finally occurred it attracted widespread notice as the virtual trial of Demosthenes. Though the effort of Æschines was a powerful one, the reply of Demosthenes, known as the celebrated oration "On the Crown," was greater, and resulted in his own complete vindication. In 322 he was in danger of being captured by his enemies, and fled to the temple of Poseidon, on the island of Calauria, where he took a fatal draught of poison. The immortal oration, "On the Crown," was delivered at Athens, 330 B.C.; it is considered the most impressive and pathetic effort in ancient oratory.]

I BEGIN, men of Athens, by praying to every god and goddess that the same good-will which I have ever cherished toward the commonwealth and all of you, may be requited to me on the present trial. I pray likewise—and this specially concerns yourselves, your religion, and your honor

—that the gods may put it in your minds not to take counsel of my opponent touching the manner in which I am to be heard—that would indeed be cruel!—but of the laws and of your oath, wherein (besides the other obligations) it is prescribed that you shall hear both sides alike. This means not only that you must pass no pre-condemnation, not only that you must extend your good-will equally to both, but also that you must allow the parties to adopt such order and course of defense as they severally choose and prefer.

Many advantages hath Æschines over me on this trial; and two especially, men of Athens. First, my risk in the contest is not the same. It is assuredly not the same for me to forfeit your regard, as for my adversary not to succeed in his indictment. To me—but I will say nothing untoward at the outset of my address. The prosecution, however, is play to him. My second disadvantage is the natural disposition of mankind to take pleasure in hearing invective and accusation, and to be annoyed by those who praise themselves. To Æschines is assigned the part which gives pleasure; that which (I may fairly say) is offensive to all is left for me. And if, to escape from this, I make no mention of what I have done, I shall appear to be without defense against his charges, without proof of my claims to honor; whereas, if I proceed to give an account of my conduct and measures, I shall be forced to speak frequently of myself. I will endeavor, then, to do so with all becoming modesty; what I am driven to by the necessity of the case will be fairly chargeable to my opponent who has instituted such a prosecution.

I think, men of the jury, you will all agree that I, as well as Ctesiphon, am a party to this proceeding, and that it is a matter of no less concern to me. It is painful and grievous to be deprived of anything, especially by the act of one's enemy; but your good-will and affection are the heaviest loss, precisely as they are the greatest prize to gain.

Such being the matters at stake in this cause, I conjure and implore you all alike to hear my defense to the charge in that fair manner which the laws prescribe—laws to which their author, Solon, a man friendly to you and to popular rights, thought that validity should be given, not only by the recording of them, but by the oath of you, the jurors; not

that he distrusted you, as it appears to me; but, seeing that the charges and calumnies, wherein the prosecutor is powerful by being the first speaker, cannot be got over by the defendant unless each of you jurors, observing his religious obligation, shall with like favor receive the arguments of the last speaker, and lend an equal and impartial ear to both, before he determines upon the whole case.

As I am, it appears, on this day to render an account both of my private life and my public measures, I would fain, as in the outset, call the gods to my aid, and in your presence I implore them, first, that the good-will which I have ever cherished toward the commonwealth and all of you may be fully requited to me on the present trial; next, that they may direct you to such a decision upon this indictment as will conduce to your common honor and to the good conscience of each individual.

Had Æschines confined his charge to the subject of the prosecution, I, too, would have proceeded at once to my justification of the decree. But since he has wasted no fewer words in the discussion of other matters, in most of them calumniating me, I deem it both necessary and just, men of Athens, to begin by shortly adverting to these points, that none of you may be induced by extraneous arguments to shut your ears against my defense to the indictment.

To all his scandalous abuse of my private life, observe my plain and honest answer. If you know me to be such as he alleged—for I have lived nowhere else but among you—let not my voice be heard, however transcendent my statesmanship! Rise up this instant and condemn me! But if, in your opinion and judgment, I am far better and of better descent than my adversary; if (to speak without offense) I am not inferior, I or mine, to any respectable citizen, then give no credit to him for his other statements—it is plain they were all equally fictions—but to me let the same goodwill, which you have uniformly exhibited upon many former trials, be manifested now. With all your malice, Æschines, it was very simple to suppose that I should turn from the discussion of measures and policy to notice your scandal. I will do no such thing; I am not so crazed. Your lies and calumnies about my political life I will examine forthwith;

for that loose ribaldry I shall have a word hereafter, if the jury desire to hear it.

The crimes whereof I am accused are many and grievous: for some of them the laws enact heavy—most severe—penalties. The scheme of this present proceeding includes a combination of spiteful insolence, insult, railing, aspersion, and everything of the kind; while for the said charges and accusations, if they were true, the state has not the means of inflicting an adequate punishment, or anything like it. For it is not right to debar another of access to the people and privilege of speech; moreover, to do so by way of malice and insult—by heaven! is neither honest, nor constitutional, nor just. If the crimes which he saw me committing against the state were as heinous as he so tragically gave out, he ought to have enforced the penalties of the law against them at the time—if he saw me guilty of an impeachable offense —by impeaching and so bringing me to trial before you; if moving illegal decrees, by indicting me for them. For surely, if he can prosecute Ctesiphon on my account, he would not have forborne to indict me myself, had he thought he could convict me. In short, whatever else he saw me doing to your prejudice, whether mentioned or not mentioned in his catalogue of slander, there are laws for such things, and punishments, and trials, and judgments, with sharp and severe penalties; all of which he might have enforced against me: and had he done so—had he thus pursued the proper method with me, his charges would have been consistent with his conduct. But now he has declined the straightforward and just course, avoided all proofs of guilt at the time, and, after this long interval, gets up, to play his part withal, a heap of accusation, ribaldry, and scandal. Then he arraigns me, but prosecutes the defendant. His hatred of me he makes the prominent part of the whole contest; yet, without having ever met me upon that ground, he openly seeks to deprive a third party of his privileges. Now, men of Athens, besides all the other arguments that may be urged in Ctesiphon's behalf, this, methinks, may very fairly be alleged—that we should try our own quarrel by ourselves; not leave our private dispute, and look what third party we can damage. That surely were the height of injustice.

It may appear from what has been said, that all his charges are alike unjust and unfounded in truth. Yet I wish to examine them separately, and especially his calumnies about the peace and the embassy, where he attributed to me the acts of himself and Philocrates. It is necessary also, and perhaps proper, men of Athens, to remind you how affairs stood at those times, that you may consider every single measure in reference to the occasion.

When the Phocian War had broken out—not through me, for I had not then commenced public life—you were in this position: you wished the Phocians to be saved, though you saw they were not acting right—and would have been glad for the Thebans to suffer anything, with whom for a just reason you were angry, for they had not borne with moderation their good fortune at Leuctra. The whole of Peloponnesus was divided: they that hated the Lacedæmonians were not powerful enough to destroy them, and they that ruled before by Spartan influence were not masters of the states. Among them, as among the rest of the Greeks, there was a sort of unsettled strife and confusion. Philip, seeing this—it was not difficult to see—lavished bribes upon the traitors in every state, embroiled and stirred them all up against each other; and so, by the errors and follies of the rest, he was strengthening himself and growing up to the ruin of all. But when every one saw that the then overbearing, but now unfortunate, Thebans, harassed by so long a war, must of necessity have recourse to you, Philip, to prevent this and obstruct the union of the states, offered to you peace, to them succor. What helped him then almost to surprise you in a voluntary snare? The cowardice, shall I call it? or ignorance—or both—of the other Greeks; who, while you were waging a long and incessant war, and that too for their common benefit, as the event has shown, assisted you neither with money nor men, nor anything else whatsoever. You, being justly and naturally offended with them, lent a willing ear to Philip.

The peace then granted was through such means brought about, not through me, as Æschines calumniously charged. The criminal and corrupt practices of these men during the treaty will be found on fair examination to be the cause of

our present condition. The whole matter I am for truth's sake discussing and going through; for, let there appear to be ever so much criminality in these transactions, it is surely nothing to me. The first who spoke and mentioned the subject of peace was Aristodemus, the actor; the seconder and mover, fellow-hireling for that purpose with the prosecutor, was Philocrates the Agnusian—your associate, Æschines, not mine, though you should burst with lying. Their supporters —from whatever motives—I pass that by for the present— were Eubulus and Cephisophon. I had nothing to do with it.

Notwithstanding these facts, which I have stated exactly according to the truth, he ventured to assert—to such a pitch of impudence had he come—that I, besides being author of the peace, had prevented the country making it in a general council with the Greeks. Why you—I know not what name you deserve!—when you saw me robbing the state of an advantage and connection so important as you described just now, did you ever express indignation? Did you come forward to publish and proclaim what you now charge me with? If, indeed, I had been bribed by Philip to prevent the conjunction of the Greeks, it was your business not to be silent, but to cry out, to protest, and inform the people. But you never did so; your voice was never heard to such a purpose; and no wonder; for at that time no embassy had been sent to any of the Greeks; they had all been tested long before, and not a word of truth upon the subject has Æschines spoken.

Besides, it is the country that he most traduces by his falsehoods. For, if you were at the same time calling on the Greeks to take arms, and sending your own ambassadors to treat with Philip for peace, you were performing the part of an Eurybatus, not the act of a commonwealth, or of honest men. But it is false, it is false. For what purpose could ye have sent for them at that period? For peace? They all had it. For war? You were yourselves deliberating about peace. It appears, therefore, I was not the adviser or the author of the original peace; and none of his other calumnies against me are shown to be true.

Observe again, after the state had concluded the peace,

what line of conduct each of us adopted. Hence, you will understand who it was that cooperated in everything with Philip; who that acted in your behalf, and sought the advantage of the commonwealth.

I moved in the council that our ambassadors should sail instantly for whatever place they heard Philip was in, and receive his oath; they would not, however, notwithstanding my resolution. What was the effect of this, men of Athens? I will explain. It was Philip's interest that the interval before the oaths should be as long as possible; yours, that it should be as short. Why? Because you discontinued all your warlike preparations, not only from the day of swearing peace, but from the day that you conceived hopes of it; a thing which Philip was from the beginning studious to contrive, believing—rightly enough—that whatever of our possessions he might take before the oath of ratification, he should hold securely, as none would break the peace on such account. I, men of Athens, foreseeing and weighing these consequences, moved the decree to sail for whatever place Philip was in, and receive his oath without delay, so that your allies, the Thracians, might be in possession of the places which Æschines ridiculed just now (Serrium, Myrtium, and Ergisce), at the time of swearing the oaths; and that Philip might not become master of Thrace by securing the posts of vantage, nor provide himself with plenty of money and troops to facilitate his further designs. Yet this decree he neither mentions nor reads, but reproaches me, because, as councilor, I thought proper to introduce the ambassadors. Why, what should I have done? Moved not to introduce men who were come for the purpose of conferring with you? or ordered the manager not to assign them places at the theater? They might have had places for their two obols if the resolution had not been moved. Was it my duty to guard the petty interests of the state, and have sold our main interests like these men? Surely not. Take and read me this decree, which the prosecutor, knowing it well, passed over. Read.

THE DECREE

"In the archonship of Mnesiphilus, on the thirteenth of Hecatombæon, in the presidency of the Pandionian tribe, Demosthenes, son of Demos-

thenes of Pæania, moved—Whereas Philip has sent ambassadors for peace, and hath agreed upon articles of treaty, it is resolved by the Council and People of Athens, in order that the peace voted in the first assembly may be ratified, to choose forthwith from the whole body of Athenians five ambassadors; and that the persons elected do repair, without any delay, wheresoever they shall ascertain that Philip is, and as speedily as may be exchange oaths with him, according to the articles agreed on between him and the Athenian people, comprehending the allies of either party. For ambassadors were chosen, Eubulus of Anaphlestus, Æschines of Cothocidæ, Cephisophon of Rhamnus, Democrates of Phlya, Cleon of Cothocidæ."

Notwithstanding that I had passed this decree for the advantage of Athens, not that of Philip, our worthy ambassadors so little regarded it as to sit down in Macedonia three whole months, until Philip returned from Thrace after entirely subjugating the country, although they might in ten days, or rather in three or four, have reached the Hellespont and saved the fortresses, by receiving his oath before he reduced them; for he would never have touched them in our presence, or we should not have sworn him; and thus he would have lost the peace, and not have obtained both the peace and the fortresses.

Such was the first trick of Philip, the first corrupt act of these accursed miscreants, in the embassy; for which I avow that I was and am and ever will be at war and variance with them. But mark another and still greater piece of villainy immediately after. When Philip had sworn to the peace, having secured Thrace through these men disobeying my decree, he again bribes them not to leave Macedonia until he had got all ready for his expedition against the Phocians. His fear was, if they reported to you his design and preparation for marching, you might sally forth, sail round with your galleys to Thermopylæ as before, and block up the strait; his desire, that, the moment you received the intelligence from them, he should have passed Thermopylæ, and you be unable to do anything. And in such terror and anxiety was Philip, lest, notwithstanding he had gained these advantages, if you voted succor before the destruction of the Phocians, his enterprise should fail, he hires this despicable fellow, no longer in common with the other ambassadors, but

by himself individually, to make that statement and report to you, by which everything was lost.

I conjure and beseech you, men of Athens, throughout the trial to remember this, that, if Æschines in his charge had not traveled out of the indictment, neither would I have spoken a word irrelevant; but since he has resorted to every species both of accusation and calumny, it is necessary for me to reply briefly to each of his charges.

What, then, were the statements made by Æschines, through which everything was lost? That you should not be alarmed by Philip's having passed Thermopylæ—that all would be as you desired, if you kept quiet; and in two or three days you would hear he was their friend to whom he had come as an enemy, and their enemy to whom he had come as a friend—it was not words that cemented attachments (such was his solemn phrase), but identity of interest; and it was the interest of all alike, Philip, the Phocians, and you, to be relieved from the harshness and insolence of the Thebans. His assertions were heard by some with pleasure, on account of the hatred which then subsisted against the Thebans. But what happened directly, almost immediately, afterward? The wretched Phocians were destroyed, their cities demolished; you that kept quiet, and trusted to Æschines, were shortly bringing in your effects out of the country, while Æschines received gold; and yet more—while you got nothing but your enmity with the Thebans and Thessalians, Philip won their gratitude for what he had done. To prove what I say, read me the decree of Callisthenes, and the letter of Philip, from both of which these particulars will be clear to you. Read.

THE DECREE

"In the archonship of Mnesiphilus, an extraordinary assembly having been convened by the generals, with the sanction of the presidents and the council, on the twenty-first of Mæmacterion, Callisthenes, son of Eteonicus of Phalerum, moved: No Athenian shall, on any pretense, sleep in the country, but all in the city and Piræus, except those who are stationed in the garrisons; and they shall every one keep the posts assigned to them, without absenting themselves by night or day. Whosoever disobeys this decree shall be amenable to the penalties of treason, unless he can show that some necessity prevented him; the judges of such

necessity shall be the General of Infantry, and he of the Finance Department, and the Secretary of the Council. All effects shall be conveyed out of the country as speedily as may be; those that are within a hundred and twenty furlongs into the city and Piræus, those that are beyond a hundred and twenty furlongs to Eleusis and Phyle and Aphidna and Rhamnus and Sunium. On the motion of Callisthenes of Phalerum."

Was it with such expectations you concluded the peace? Were such the promises this hireling made you? Come, read the letter which Philip sent after this to Athens.

THE LETTER OF PHILIP

"Philip, King of Macedonia, to the Council and People of Athens, greeting. Ye know that we have passed Thermopylæ, and reduced Phocis to submission, and put garrisons in the towns that opened their gates; those that resisted we took by storm, and razed to the ground, enslaving their inhabitants. Hearing, however, that ye are preparing to assist them, I have written unto you, that ye may trouble yourselves no farther in the business. For it seems to me, ye are acting altogether unreasonably; having concluded peace, and nevertheless taking the field, and that too when the Phocians are not comprehended in our treaty. Wherefore, if ye abide not by your engagements, ye will gain no advantage but that of being the aggressors."

You hear how plainly, in his letter to you, he declares and asserts to his own allies—"All this I have done against the will of the Athenians, and in their despite; therefore, if ye are wise, ye Thebans and Thessalians, ye will regard them as enemies, and put confidence in me"; not writing in such words, but meaning so to be understood. And by these means he carried them away with him, insomuch that they had neither foresight nor sense of the consequences, but suffered him to get everything into his power; hence the misfortunes under which those wretched people at present are. The agent and auxiliary who helped to win for him such confidence—who brought false reports here and cajoled you—he it is who now bewails the sufferings of the Thebans and dilates upon them so pathetically, he himself being the cause both of these calamities, and those in Phocis, and all the rest which the Greeks have sustained. Truly must you, Æschines, grieve at these events, and compassionate the Thebans, when

you hold property in Bœotia and farm their lands; and I rejoice at a work whose author immediately required me to be delivered into his hands.

But I have fallen upon a subject which it may be more convenient to discuss by and by. I will return then to my proofs, showing how the iniquities of these men have brought about the present state of things.

When you had been deceived by Philip through the agency of these men, who sold themselves in the embassies, and reported not a word of truth to you—when the unhappy Phocians had been deceived and their cities destroyed—what followed? The despicable Thessalians and stupid Thebans looked on Philip as a friend, a benefactor, a savior: he was everything with them—not a syllable would they hear from any one to the contrary. You, though regarding his acts with suspicion and anger, still observed the peace; for you could have done nothing alone. The rest of the Greeks, cheated and disappointed like yourselves, gladly observed the peace, though they also had in a manner been attacked for a long time. For when Philip was marching about, subduing Illyrians and Triballians and some also of the Greeks, and gaining many considerable accessions of power, and certain citizens of the states (Æschines among them) took advantage of the peace to go there and be corrupted, all people then, against whom he was making such preparations, were attacked. If they perceived it not, that is another question, no concern of mine. I was forever warning and protesting, both at Athens and wheresoever I was sent. But the states were diseased; one class in their politics and measures being venal and corrupt, while the multitude of private men either had no foresight, or were caught with the bait of present ease and idleness; and all were under some such influence, only they imagined each that the mischief would not approach themselves, but that by the peril of others they might secure their own safety when they chose. The result, I fancy, has been that the people, in return for their gross and unseasonable indolence, have lost their liberty; the statesmen, who imagined they were selling everything but themselves, discovered they had sold themselves first; for, instead of friends, as they were named during the period of bribery, they are now called

parasites and miscreants and the like befitting names. Justly. For no man, O Athenians, spends money for the traitor's benefit, or, when he has got possession of his purchase, employs the traitor to advise him in future proceedings; else nothing could have been more fortunate than a traitor. But it is not so—it never could be—it is far otherwise! When the aspirant for power has gained his object, he is master also of those that sold it; and then—then, I say, knowing their baseness, he loathes and mistrusts and spurns them.

Consider only—for though the time of the events is past, the time for understanding them is ever present to the wise: Lasthenes was called the friend of Philip for a while, until he betrayed Olynthus; Timolaus for a while, until he destroyed Thebes; Rudicus and Simus of Larissa for a while, until they brought Thessaly under Philip's power. Since then the world has become full of traitors expelled and insulted and suffering every possible calamity. How fared Aristratus in Sicyon? how Perilaus in Megara? Are they not outcasts? Hence, one may evidently see, it is the vigilant defender of his country, the strenuous opponent of such men, who secures to you traitors and hirelings, Æschines, the opportunity of getting bribes; through the number of those that oppose your wishes you are in safety and in pay, for had it depended on yourselves you would have perished long ago.

Much more could I say about those transactions, yet methinks too much has been said already. The fault is my adversary's, for having spurted over me the dregs, I may say, of his own wickedness and iniquities, of which I was obliged to clear myself to those who are younger than the events. You, too, have probably been disgusted, who knew this man's venality before I spoke a word. He calls it friendship, indeed, and said somewhere in his speech—"the man who reproaches me with the friendship of Alexander." I reproach you with the friendship of Alexander! Whence gotten, or how merited? Neither Philip's friend nor Alexander's should I ever call you; I am not so mad; unless we are to call reapers and other hired laborers the friends of those who hire them. That, however, is not so—how could it be? It is nothing of the kind. Philip's hireling I called you once, and Alexander's I call you now. So do all these

men. If you disbelieve me, ask them; or rather I will do it for you. Athenians! is Æschines, think ye, the hireling or the friend of Alexander? You hear what they say.

I now proceed to my defense upon the indictment itself, and to the account of my own measures, that Æschines may hear, though he knows already, on what I found my title both to these which have been decreed and to far greater rewards. Take and read me the indictment itself.

THE INDICTMENT

"In the archonship of Chærondas, on the sixth of Elaphebolion, Æschines, son of Atrometus of Cothocidæ, preferred before the archon an indictment against Ctesiphon, son of Leosthenes of Anaphlystus, for an illegal measure: for that he proposed a decree against law, to wit, that it was right to crown Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, with a golden crown and to proclaim in the theater at the great Dionysian festival, at the exhibition of the new tragedies, that the people crown Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, with a golden crown, on account of his virtue, and of the good-will which he has constantly cherished toward all the Greeks as well as toward the people of Athens, and of his intregity, and because he has constantly, by word and deed, promoted the advantage of the people, and is zealous to do whatever good he can: all which clauses are false and illegal; the laws enacting: firstly, that no false allegations shall be entered in the public records; secondly, that an accountable officer shall not be crowned (but Demosthenes is a conservator of the walls, and has charge of the theoric fund); thirdly, that the crown shall not be proclaimed in the theater at the Dionysian festival, on the new exhibition of tragedies, but if the council confer a crown, it shall be published in the council-hall; if the people, in the Pnyx at the assembly. Penalty, fifty talents. Witnesses to the summons, Cephisophon, son of Cephisophon of Rhamnus, Cleon, son of Cleon of Cothocidæ."

The clauses of the decree which he prosecutes are these, men of Athens. Now from these very clauses I think I shall immediately make it clear to you that my whole defense will be just; for I shall take the charges in the same order as my adversary, and discuss them all one by one, without a single intentional omission.

With respect to the statement "that I have constantly, by word and deed, promoted the advantage of the people,

and am zealous to do whatever good I can," and the praising me on such grounds, your judgment, I conceive, must depend on my public acts; from an examination of which it will be discovered whether what Ctesiphon has alleged concerning me is true and proper, or false. As to his proposing to give the crown without adding "when he has passed his accounts," and to proclaim the crown in the theater, I imagine that this also relates to my political conduct, whether I am worthy of the crown and the public proclamation or not. However, I deem it necessary to produce the laws which justified the defendant in proposing such clauses.

Thus honestly and simply, men of Athens, have I resolved to conduct my defense. I now proceed to my own actual measures. And let no one suppose that I wander from the indictment if I touch upon Grecian questions and affairs: he who attacks that clause of the decree, "that by word and deed I have promoted your good"—he who has indicted this for being false—he, I say, has rendered the discussion of my whole policy pertinent and necessary to the charge. Moreover, there being many departments of political action, I chose that which belonged to Grecian affairs; therefore I am justified in drawing my proofs from them.

The conquests which Philip had got and held before I commenced life as a statesman and orator, I shall pass over, as I think they concern not me. Those that he was baffled in from the day of my entering on such duties, I will call to your recollection, and render an account of them; premising one thing only—Philip started, men of Athens, with a great advantage. It happened that among the Greeks—not some, but all alike—there sprang up a crop of traitors and venal wretches, such as in the memory of man had never been before. These he got for his agents and supporters: the Greeks, already ill-disposed and unfriendly to each other, he brought into a still worse state, deceiving this people, making presents to that, corrupting others in every way; and he split them into many parties, when they had all one interest, to prevent his aggrandizement. While the Greeks were all in such a condition—in such ignorance of the gathering and growing mischief—you have to consider, men of Athens, what policy and measures it became the commonwealth to adopt, and of

this to receive a reckoning from me; for the man who assumed that post in the administration was I.

Ought she, Æschines, to have cast off her spirit and dignity, and, in the style of Thessalians and Dolopians, helped to acquire for Philip the dominion of Greece, and extinguished the honors and rights of our ancestors? Or, if she did not this—which would indeed have been shameful—was it right that what she saw would happen if unprevented, and was for a long time, it seems, aware of, she should suffer to come to pass?

I would gladly ask the severest censurer of our acts, with what party he would have wished the commonwealth to side —with those who contributed to the disgraces and disasters of the Greeks, the party, we may say, of the Thessalians and their followers, or those who permitted it all for the hope of selfish advantage, among whom we may reckon the Arcadians, Messenians, and Argives? But many of them, or rather all, have fared worse than ourselves. If Philip after his victory had immediately marched off and kept quiet, without molesting any either of his own allies or of the Greeks in general, still they that opposed not his enterprises would have merited some blame and reproach. But when he has stripped all alike of their dignity, their authority, their liberty—nay, even of their constitutions, where he was able—can it be doubted that you took the most glorious course in pursuance of my counsels?

But I return to the question—What should the commonwealth, Æschines, have done, when she saw Philip establishing an empire and dominion over Greece? Or what was your statesman to advise or move?—I, a statesman at Athens?—for this is most material—I who knew that from the earliest time, until the day of my own mounting the platform, our country had ever striven for precedency and honor and renown, and expended more blood and treasure for the sake of glory and the general weal than the rest of the Greeks had expended on their several interests?—who saw that in the strife for power and empire, Philip himself, with whom we were contending, had had his eye cut out, his collar bone fractured, his hand and leg mutilated, and was ready and willing to sacrifice any part of his body that for-

tune chose to take, provided he could live with the remainder in honor and glory? Hardly will any one venture to say this—that it became a man bred at Pella, then an obscure and inconsiderable place, to possess such inborn magnanimity as to aspire to the mastery of Greece and form the project in his mind, while you, who were Athenians, day after day in speeches and in dramas reminded of the virtue of your ancestors, should have been so naturally base as of your own free will and accord to surrender to Philip the liberty of Greece. No man will say this!

The only course, then, that remained was a just resistance to all his attacks upon you. Such course you took from the beginning, properly and becomingly; and I assisted by motions and counsels during the period of my political life —I acknowledge it. But what should I have done? I put this question to you, dismissing all else: Amphipolis, Pydna, Potidæa, Halonnesus—I mention none of them: Serrium, Doriscus, the ravaging of Peparethus, and any similar wrongs which the country has suffered—I know not even of their occurrence. You, indeed, said that by talking of these I had brought the people into a quarrel, although the resolutions respecting them were moved by Eubulus and Aristophon and Diopithes—not by me, you ready utterer of what suits your purpose! Neither will I speak of these now. But I ask—the man who was appropriating to himself Eubœa, and making it a fortress against Attica, and attempting Megara, and seizing Oreus, and razing Porthmus, and setting up Philistides as tyrant in Oreus, Clitarchus in Eretria, and subjugating the Hellespont, and besieging Byzantium, and destroying some of the Greek cities, restoring exiles to others—was he by all these proceedings committing injustice, breaking the truce, violating the peace, or not? Was it meet that any of the Greeks should rise up to prevent these proceedings, or not? If not—if Greece were to present the spectacle (as it is called) of a Mysian prey, while Athenians had life and being, then I have exceeded my duty in speaking on the subject—the commonwealth has exceeded her duty, which followed my counsels—I admit that every measure has been a misdeed, a blunder of mine. But if some one ought to have arisen to prevent these things, who but the Athenian

people should it have been? Such, then, was the policy which I espoused. I saw him reducing all men to subjection and I opposed him; I continued warning and exhorting you not to make these sacrifices to Philip.

It was he that infringed the peace by taking our ships; it was not the state, Æschines. Produce the decrees themselves, and Philip's letter, and read them one after another. From an examination of them it will be evident who is chargeable with each proceeding. Read.

THE DECREE

"In the archonship of Neocles, in the month Boedromion, an extraordinary assembly having been convened by the generals, Eubulus, son of Mnesitheus of Cytherus, moved: Whereas the generals have reported in the assembly that Leodamas the admiral, and the twenty vessels despatched with him to the Hellespont for the safe conduct of the corn, have been carried to Macedonia by Philip's general, Amyntas, and are detained in custody, let the presidents and the generals take care that the council be convened, and ambassadors to Philip be chosen, who shall go and treat with him for the release of the admiral, vessels, and troops; and if Amyntas has acted in ignorance, they shall say that the people make no complaint against him; if the admiral is found wrongfully exceeding his instructions, that the Athenians will make inquiry and punish him as his negligence deserves; if it be neither of these things, but a willful trespass on the part of him who gave or him who received the commission, let them state this also, that the people, being apprised, may deliberate what course to take."

This decree Eubulus carried, not I. The next, Aristophon; then Hegesippus, then Aristophon again, then Philocrates, then Cephisophon, then the rest. I had no concern in the matter. Read the decree.

THE DECREE

"In the archonship of Neocles, on the last day of Boedromion, at the desire of the council, the presidents and generals introduced their report of the proceedings of the assembly, to wit: that the people had resolved to appoint ambassadors to Philip for the recovery of the ships, and to furnish them with instructions and with the decrees of the assembly; and they appointed the following: Cephisophon, son of Cleon of Anaphlystus; Democritus, son of Demophon of Anagyrus; Polycritus,

son of Apemantus of Cothocidæ. In the presidency of the Hippothoontian tribe, on the motion of Aristophon of Colyttus, committeeman."

Now, then, as I produce these decrees, so do you, Æschines, point out what decree of my passing makes me chargeable with the war. You cannot find one; had you any, there is nothing you would sooner have produced. Why, even Philip makes no charge against me on account of the war, though he complains of others. Read Philip's own letter.

THE LETTER OF PHILIP

"Philip, king of Macedon, to the Council and People of Athens greeting. Your ambassadors, Cephisophon, Democritus, and Polycritus, came to me and conferred about the release of the galleys which Laomedon commanded. Upon the whole, I think you must be very simple if you imagine I do not see that those galleys were commissioned, under the pretense of conveying corn from the Hellespont to Lemnos, to relieve the Selymbrians, whom I am besieging, and who are not included in the friendly treaty subsisting between us. And these instructions were given without leave of the Athenian people, by certain magistrates and others who are not now in office, but who are anyways desirous for the people to exchange our present amity for a renewal of war, and are far more anxious for such a consummation than to relieve the Selymbrians. They suppose it will be a source of income to themselves; however, I scarcely think it is for your advantage or mine. Wherefore I release you the vessels carried into my port; and for the future, if, instead of allowing your statesmen to adopt malignant measures, you will punish them, I too will endeavor to maintain the peace. Farewell."

Here is no mention by him of Demosthenes, or any charge against me. Why, then, while he complains of the others, makes he no mention of my acts? Because he must have noticed his own aggressions, had he written aught concerning me; for on these I fixed myself — these I kept resisting. And first I proposed the embassy to Peloponnesus, when into Peloponnesus he began to steal; next that to Eubœa, when on Eubœa he was laying his hands; then the expedition (no longer an embassy) to Oreus, and that to Eretria, when he established rulers in those cities. Afterward I despatched all the armaments, by which Chersonesus was preserved, and Byzantium, and all our allies; whence to you

there accrued the noblest results—praises, eulogies, honors, crowns, thanks from those you succored; while the people attacked—those that trusted you then obtained deliverance, those that disregarded you have had often to remember your warnings and to be convinced that you were not only their friends, but wise men also and prophets: for all that you predicted has come to pass.

That Philistides would have given a great deal to keep Oreus—Clitarchus a great deal to keep Eretria—Philip himself a great deal to have these vantage-posts against you, and in other matters to avoid exposure, and any inquiry into his wrongful acts in general—no man is ignorant, and least of all you. For the ambassadors who came here then from Clitarchus and Philistides lodged with you, Æschines, and you were their host. The commonwealth regarded them as enemies, whose offers were neither just nor advantageous, and expelled them; but they were your friends. None of their designs then were accomplished; you slanderer—who say of me that I am silent when I have got something, and bawl when I have spent it! That is not your custom. You bawl when you have something, and will never stop, unless the jury stop you by disfranchisement to-day.

When you crowned me then for those services, and Aristonicus drew up the same words that Ctesiphon here has now drawn up, and the crown was proclaimed in the theater —for this now is the second proclamation in my favor— Æschines, being present, neither opposed it nor indicted the mover. Take this decree now and read it.

THE DECREE

"In the archonship of Chærondas, son of Hegemon, on the twenty-fifth of Gamelion, in the presidency of the Leontian tribe, Aristonicus of Phrearrii moved: Whereas, Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, hath rendered many important services to the people of Athens, and to divers of her allies heretofore, and hath also on the present occasion aided them by his decrees, and liberated certain of the cities in Eubœa, and perseveres in his attachment to the people of Athens, and doth by word and deed whatever good he can for the Athenians themselves and the rest of the Greeks; It is resolved by the Council and People of Athens, to honor Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, with

public praise and a golden crown, and to proclaim the crown in the theater at the Dionysian festival at the new tragedies, and the proclamation of the crown shall be given in charge to the presiding tribe and the prize-master. On the motion of Aristonicus of Phrearrii."

Is there one of you that knows of any disgrace falling on the state by reason of this decree, or any scorn or ridicule—consequences which this man now predicts, if I be crowned? It is when acts are recent and notorious that, if good, they obtain reward, if the contrary, punishment; and it appears that I then obtained reward, not blame or punishment. So, up to the period of those transactions, I am acknowledged on all occasions to have promoted the interests of the state—because my speeches and motions prevailed in your councils—because my measures were executed, and procured crowns for the commonwealth and for me and all of you—because you have offered sacrifices and thanksgivings to the gods for their success.

When Philip therefore was driven out of Eubœa, with arms by you, with councils and decrees—though some persons there should burst!—by me, he sought some new position of attack upon Athens. Seeing that we use more foreign corn than any people, and wishing to command the passage of the corn trade, he advanced to Thrace; the Byzantines being his allies, he first required them to join in the war against you, and when they refused, saying (truly enough) that they had not made alliance on such terms, he threw up intrenchments before the city, planted batteries, and laid siege to it. What course hereupon it became you to take, I will not ask again; it is manifest to all. But who was it that succored the Byzantines and rescued them? Who prevented the alienation of the Hellespont at that crisis? You, men of Athens. When I say you, I mean the commonwealth. But who advised, framed, executed the measures of state, devoted himself wholly and unreservedly to the public business?—I! What benefits thence accrued to all, you need no further to be told; you have learned by experience. For the war which then sprang up, besides that it brought honor and renown, kept you in a cheaper and more plentiful supply of all the necessaries of life than does the present peace, which

these worthies maintain to their country's prejudice in the hope of something to come. Perish such hope! Never may they share the blessings for which you men of honest wishes pray to the gods, nor communicate their own principles to you!

Read them now the crowns of the Byzantines, and those of the Perinthians, which they conferred upon the country as a reward.

THE BYZANTINE DECREE

"In the presbytership of Bosporichus, Damagetus moved in the assembly, having obtained permission of the Council: Whereas the people of Athens have ever in former times been friendly to the Byzantines and their allies, and to their kinsmen the Perinthians, and have rendered them many signal services, and also, on the present occasion, when Philip of Macedon attempted by invasion and siege to exterminate the Byzantines and Perinthians, and burned and ravaged their country, they succored us with a hundred and twenty ships and provisions and weapons and soldiers, and rescued us from grievous perils, and preserved our hereditary constitution, our laws, and our sepulchres; it is resolved by the people of Byzantium and Perinthus to grant unto the Athenians the right of intermarriage, citizenship, purchase of land and houses, the first seat at the games, first admission to the council and people after the sacrifices, and exemption from all public services to such as wish to reside in the city; and that three statues of sixteen cubits be erected in the harbor, representing the people of Athens crowned by the people of Byzantium and Perinthus; and deputations sent to the general assemblies of Greece—the Isthmian, Nemean, Olympian, and Pythian—to proclaim the crowns wherewith the people of Athens hath been honored by us, that all the Greeks may know the virtue of the Athenians and the gratitude of the Byzantines and Perinthians."

Now read the crowns given by the people of Chersonesus.

THE DECREE

"The Chersonesites, inhabitants of Sestus, Eleus, Madytus, and Alopeconnesus, crown the Council and People of Athens with a golden crown of the value of sixty talents, and build an altar to Gratitude and the Athenian People, because that people hath helped the Chersonesites to obtain the greatest of blessings, by rescuing them from the power of Philip, and restoring their country, their laws, their liberty, their sanctuaries; and in all future time they will not fail to be grateful, and do what service they can. Decreed in general council."

Thus the saving of Chersonesus and Byzantium, the preventing Philip's conquest of the Hellespont, and the honors therefore bestowed on this country, were the effects of my policy and administration; and more than this—they proved to all mankind the generosity of Athens and the baseness of Philip. He, the ally and friend of the Byzantines, was before all eyes besieging them—what could be more shameful or outrageous? You, who might justly on many grounds have reproached them for wrongs done you in former times, instead of bearing malice and abandoning the oppressed, appeared as their deliverers—conduct which procured you glory, good-will, honor from all men. That you have crowned many of your statemen, every one knows; but through what other person (I mean what minister or orator) besides myself, the commonwealth has been crowned, no one can say.

To prove now the malignity of those calumnies, which he urged against the Eubœans and Byzantines, reminding you of any unkindness which they had done you—prove it I shall, not only by their falsehood, which I apprehend you know already, but (were they ever so true) by showing the advantages of my policy—I wish to recount one or two of the noble acts of your own state, and to do it briefly; for individuals, as well as communities, should ever strive to model their future conduct by the noblest of their past.

Well, then, men of Athens, when the Lacedæmonians had the empire of land and sea, and held the country round Attica by governors and garrisons, Eubœa, Tanagra, all Bœotia, Megara, Ægina, Cleonæ, the other islands; when our state possessed neither ships nor walls, you marched out to Haliartus, and again not many days after to Corinth; albeit the Athenians of that time had many causes of resentment against both Corinthians and Thebans for their acts in the Decelean war; but they showed no resentment, none. And yet neither of these steps took they, Æschines, for benefactors, nor were they blind to the danger; but they would not for such reasons abandon people who sought their protection; for the sake of renown and glory they willingly exposed themselves to peril. Just and noble was their resolve! For to all mankind the end of life is death, though one keep

oneself shut up in a closet; but it becomes brave men to strive always for honor, with good hope before them, and to endure courageously whatever the Deity ordains.

Thus did your ancestors, thus the elder among yourselves. For, though the Lacedæmonians were neither friends nor benefactors, but had done many grievous injuries to our state, yet when the Thebans, victorious at Leuctra, sought their destruction, you prevented it, not fearing the power and reputation then possessed by the Thebans, nor reckoning up the merits of those whom you were about to fight for. And so you demonstrated to all the Greeks that, however any people may offend you, you reserve your anger against them for other occasions; but should their existence or liberty be imperiled, you will not resent your wrongs or bring them into account.

And not in these instances only hath such been your temper. Again, when the Thebans were taking possession of Eubœa, you looked not quietly on, you remembered not the wrongs done you by Themison and Theodorus in the affair of Oropus, but assisted even them. It was the time when the volunteer captains first offered themselves to the state, of whom I was one; but of this presently. However, it was glorious that you saved the island, but far more glorious that, when you had got their persons and their cities in your power, you fairly restored them to the people who had ill-used you, and made no reckoning of your wrongs in an affair where you were trusted.

Hundreds of cases which I could mention I pass over—sea fights, land marches, campaigns, both in ancient times and in your own, all of which the commonwealth has undertaken for the freedom and safety of the Greeks in general. Then, having observed the commonwealth engaging in contests of such number and importance for the interests of others, what was I to urge, what course to recommend her when the question in a manner concerned herself? To revive grudges, I suppose, against people who wanted help, and to seek pretenses for abandoning everything. And who might not justly have killed me, had I attempted, even by words, to tarnish any of the honors of Athens? For the thing itself, I am certain, you would never have done—had you

wished, what was to hinder you? any lack of opportunity? —had you not these men to advise it?

I must return to the next in date of my political acts, and here again consider what was most beneficial for the state. I saw, men of Athens, that your navy was decaying, and that, while the rich were getting off with small payments, citizens of moderate or small fortunes were losing their substance, and the state, by reason thereof, missing her opportunities of action. I therefore proposed a law by which I compelled the one class (the rich) to perform their duty, and stopped the oppression of the poor; and—what was most useful to the country—I caused her preparations to be made in time. And being indicted for it, I appeared on the charge before you and was acquitted; and the prosecutor did not get his portion of the votes. But what sums, think ye, the chief men of the boards, or those in the second and third degrees, offered me, first, not to propose that law, second, when I had recorded it, to drop it on the abatement oath? Such sums, men of Athens, as I should be afraid to tell you. And no wonder they did so; for under the former laws they might divide the charge between sixteen, spending little or nothing themselves, and grinding down the needy citizens; whereas under my law every one had to pay a sum proportioned to his means, and there was a captain for two ships, where before there was a partner with fifteen others for one ship—for they were calling themselves not captains any longer, but partners. They would have given anything then to get these regulations annulled, and not be obliged to perform their duties. Read me, first, the decree for which I appeared to the indictment, then the service rolls, that of the former law, and that under mine. Read.

THE DECREE

"In the archonship of Polycles, on the sixteenth of Boedromion, in the presidency of the Hippothoontian tribe, Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, introduced a law for the naval service instead of the former one under which there were the associations of joint captains; and it was passed by the council and people. And Patrocles of Phlyus preferred an indictment against Demosthenes for an illegal measure,

and, not having obtained his share of the votes, paid the penalty of five hundred drachms."

Now produce that fine roll.

THE ROLL

"Let sixteen captains be called out for every galley, as they are associated in the companies, from the age of twenty-five to forty, defraying the charge equally."

Now for the roll under my law.

THE ROLL

"Let captains be chosen according to their property by valuation, taking ten talents to a galley: if the property be valued at a higher sum let the charge be proportionate, as far as three ships and a tender; and let it be in the same proportion for those whose property is less than ten talents, joining them in a partnership to make up ten talents."

Think ye I but slightly helped the poor of Athens, or that the rich would have spent but a trifling sum to escape the doing what was right? I glory, however, not only in having refused this compromise, and having been acquitted on the indictment, but because my law was beneficial, and I have proved it so by trial. For during the whole war, while the armaments were shipped off according to my regulations, no captain ever appealed to you against oppression, or took sanctuary at Munychia, or was imprisoned by the clearing officers; no galley was lost to the state by capture abroad, or left behind from unfitness to go to sea. Under the former laws all these things happened—because the burden was put upon the poor, and therefore difficulties frequently arose. I transferred the charge from the poor to the wealthy, and then every duty was done. For this itself, too, I deserve praise, that I adopted all such measures as brought glory and honor and power to the state; there is no envy, spite, or malice in any measure of mine, nothing sordid or unworthy of Athens. The same character is apparent in my home and in my foreign policy. At home, I never preferred the favor of the wealthy to the rights of the many: abroad, I valued not the presents or the friendship of Philip above the general interests of Greece.

I conceive it remains for me to speak of the proclamation and the accounts: for that I acted for the best—that I have throughout been your friend and zealous in your service is proved abundantly, methinks, by what I have said already. The most important part of my policy and administration I pass by, considering that I have in regular course to reply to the charge of illegality; and besides—though I am silent as to the rest of my political acts—the knowledge you all have will serve me equally well.

As to the arguments which he jumbled together about the counter-written laws, I hardly suppose you comprehend them—I myself could not understand the greater part. However, I shall argue a just case in a straightforward way. So far from saying that I am not accountable, as the prosecutor just now falsely asserted, I acknowledge that I am all my life accountable for what as your statesman I have undertaken or advised; but for what I have voluntarily given to the people out of my own private fortune, I deny that I am any day accountable—do you hear, Æschines?—nor is any other man, let him even be one of the nine archons. For what law is so full of injustice and inhumanity as to enact that one who has given of his private means and done an act of generosity and munificence, instead of having thanks, shall be brought before malignants, appointed to be the auditors of his liberality? None. If he says there is, let him produce it, and I will be content and hold my tongue. But there is none, men of Athens. The prosecutor in his malice, because I gave some of my own money when I superintended the theoric fund, says: "The council praised him before he had rendered his account." Not for any matters of which I had an account to render, but for what I spent of my own, you malignant!

"Oh, but you were a Conservator of Walls!" says he. Yes; and for that reason was I justly praised, because I gave the sums expended and did not charge them. A charge requires auditing and examiners; a donation merits thanks and praise; therefore the defendant made this motion in my favor.

That this is a settled principle in your hearts as well as in the laws, I can show by many proofs easily. First, Nausicles

has often been crowned by you for what he expended out of his own funds while he was general. Secondly, Diotimus was crowned for his present of shields; and Charidemus too. Again, Neoptolemus here, superintendent of divers works, has been honored for his donations. It would, indeed, be cruel if a man holding an office should either, by reason of his office, be precluded from giving his own money to the state, or have, instead of receiving thanks, to render an account of what he gave. To prove the truth of my statements take and read me the original decrees made in favor of these men.

A DECREE

"Archon, Demonicus of Phlyus. On the twenty-sixth of Boedromion, with the sanction of the council and people, Callias of Phrearrii moved: That the council and people resolve to crown Nausicles, general of foot, for that, there being two thousand Athenian troops of the line in Imbrus, for the defense of the Athenian residents in that island, and Philo of the Finance Department being by reason of storms unable to sail and pay the troops, he advanced money of his own and did not ask the people for it again; and that the crown be proclaimed at the Dionysian festival, at the new tragedies."

ANOTHER DECREE

"Callias of Phrearrii moved, the presidents declaring it to be with the sanction of the council: Whereas Charidemus, general of foot, having been sent to Salamis, he and Diotimus, general of horse, after certain of the troops had in the skirmish by the river been disarmed by the enemy, did at their own expense arm the young men with eight hundred shields: It hath been resolved by the council and people to crown Charidemus and Diotimus with a golden crown, and to proclaim it at the great Panathenaic festival, during the gymnastic contest, and at the Dionysian festival, at the exhibition of the new tragedies: the proclamation to be given in charge to the judges, the presidents, and the prize masters."

Each of these men, Æschines, was accountable for the office which he held, but not accountable for the matters in respect of which he was crowned. No more then am I; for surely I have the same rights, under the same circumstances, as other men. Have I given money? I am praised for that, not being accountable for what I gave. Did I hold office? Yes; and I have rendered an account of my official

acts, not of my bounties. Oh, but I was guilty of malpractices in office! And you, present when the auditors brought me up, accused me not?

To show you that he himself bears testimony to my having been crowned for what I had no account to render of, take and read the whole decree drawn up in my favor. By the portions of the bill which he never indicted it will appear that his prosecution is vexatious. Read.

THE DECREE

"In the archonship of Euthycles, on the twenty-second of Pyanepsion, in the presidency of the Œneian tribe, Ctesiphon, son of Leosthenes of Anaphlystus, moved: Whereas Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, having been superintendent of the repair of the walls, and having expended on the works three additional talents out of his own money, hath given that sum to the people; and whereas, having been appointed treasurer of the theoric fund, he hath given to the theoric officers of the tribes a hundred minas toward the sacrifices, the council and people of Athens have resolved to honor Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, with public praise for the goodness and generosity which he has shown throughout on every occasion toward the people of Athens, and to crown him with a golden crown, and to proclaim the crown in the theater, at the Dionysian festival, at the performance of the new tragedies: the proclamation to be given in charge to the prize master."

These were my donations; none of which have you indicted; the rewards which the council says I deserve for them are what you arraign. To receive the gifts then you confess to be legal; the requital of them you indict for illegality. In the name of heaven! what sort of person can a monster of wickedness and malignity be, if not such a person as this?

Concerning the proclamation in the theater, I pass over the fact that thousands of thousands have been proclaimed, and I myself have been crowned often before. But by the gods! are you so perverse and stupid, Æschines, as not to be able to reflect that the party crowned has the same glory from the crown wherever it be published, and that the proclamation is made in the theater for the benefit of those who confer the crown? For the hearers are all encouraged to

render service to the state, and praise the parties who show their gratitude more than the party crowned. Therefore has our commonwealth enacted this law. Take and read me the law itself.

THE LAW

"Whensoever any of the townships bestow crowns, proclamations thereof shall be made by them in their several townships, unless where any are crowned by the people of Athens or the council; and it shall be lawful for them to be proclaimed in the theater at the Dionysian festival."

Do you hear, Æschines, the law distinctly saying—"Unless where any are voted by the people or the council; such may be proclaimed?" Why, then, wretched man, do you play the pettifogger? Why manufacture arguments? Why don't you take hellebore for your malady? Are you not ashamed to bring on a cause for spite and not for any offense? to alter some laws and to garble others, the whole of which should in justice be read to persons sworn to decide according to the laws? And you that act thus describe the qualities which belong to a friend of the people, as if you had ordered a statue according to contract, and received it without having what the contract required; or as if friends of the people were known by words, and not by acts and measures! And you bawl out, regardless of decency, a sort of cart-language, applicable to yourself and your race, not to me.

Again, men of Athens, I conceive abuse to differ from accusation in this, that accusation has to do with offenses for which the laws provide penalties, abuse with the scandal which enemies speak against each other according to their humor. And I believe our ancestors built these courts, not that we should assemble you here and bring forth the secrets of private life for mutual reproach, but to give us the means of convicting persons guilty of crimes against the state. Æschines knew this as well as I, and yet he chose to rail rather than to accuse.

Even in this way he must take as much as he gives; but before I enter upon such matters, let me ask him one question—Should one call you the state's enemy or mine, Æschines? Mine, of course. Yet, where you might, for any offense which I committed, have obtained satisfaction for the

people according to the laws, you neglected it—at the audit, on the indictments, and other trials; but where I in my own person am safe on every account, by the laws, by time, by prescription, by many previous judgments on every point, by my never having been convicted of a public offense—and where the country must share, more or less, in the repute of measures which were her own—here it is you have encountered me. See if you are not the people's enemy, while you pretend to be mine!

Since, therefore, the righteous and true verdict is made clear to all; but I must, it seems—though not naturally fond of railing, yet on account of the calumnies uttered by my opponent—in reply to so many falsehoods, just mention some leading particulars concerning him, and show who he is, and from whom descended, that so readily begins using hard words—and what language he carps at, after uttering such as any decent man would have shuddered to pronounce. Why, if my accuser had been Æacus, or Rhadamanthus, or Minos, instead of a prater, a hack of the market, a pestilent scribbler, I don't think he would have spoken such things, or found such offensive terms, shouting, as in a tragedy, "O Earth! O Sun! O Virtue!" and the like; and again appealing to intelligence and education, by which the honorable is distinguished from the base:—all this you undoubtedly heard from his lips. Accursed one! What have you or yours to do with virtue? How should you discern what is honorable or otherwise? How were you ever qualified? What right have you to talk about education? Those who really possess it would never say as much of themselves, but rather blush if another did; those who are destitute like you, but make pretensions to it from stupidity, annoy the hearers by their talk, without getting the reputation which they desire.

I am at no loss for materials concerning you and your family, but am in doubt what to mention first—whether how your father Tromes, being servant to Elpias, who kept a reading-school in the temple of Theseus, wore a weight of fetters and a collar; or how your mother, by her morning spousals in the cottage by Hero Calamites, reared up you, the beautiful statue, the eminent third-rate actor!

But all know without my telling these things; or how the galley piper Phormio, the slave of Dion of Phrearrii, removed her from that honorable employment. But, by Jupiter and the gods! I fear, in saying what is proper about you, I may be thought to have chosen topics unbecoming to myself. All this, therefore, I shall pass by, and commence with the acts of his own life; for, indeed, he came not of common parents, but of such as are execrated by the people. Very lately—lately, do I say?—it is but yesterday that he has become both an Athenian and an orator—adding two syllables, he converted his father from Tromes to Atrometus, and dignified his mother by the name of Glaucothea, who (as every one knows) was called Empusa; having got that title (it is plain) from her doing and submitting to anything—how else could she have got it? However, you are so ungrateful and wicked by nature, that after being raised through the people from servitude to freedom, from beggary to affluence, instead of returning their kindness, you work against them as a hireling politician.

Of the speeches, which it may possibly be contended he has made for the good of the country, I will say nothing; of the acts which he was clearly proved to have done for the enemy, I will remind you.

What man present but knows of the outcast Antiphon, who came into the city under promise to Philip that he would burn your arsenal? I found him concealed in Piræus, and brought him before the Assembly; when this mischief-maker, shouting and clamoring that it was monstrous in a free state that I should ill-treat unfortunate citizens, and enter houses without warrant, procured his release. And had not the Council of Areopagus, discovering the fact, and perceiving your ill-timed error, made search after the man, seized and brought him before you, a fellow like that would have been rescued, would have slipped through the hands of justice, and been sent out of the way by this declaimer. As it was, you put him to torture and to death, as you ought this man also. The Council of Areopagus were informed what Æschines had done, and therefore, though you had elected him for your advocate on the question of the Delian temple, in the same ignorance by which you have sacrificed

many of the public interests, as you referred the matter to the council, and gave them full powers, they immediately removed him for his treason, and appointed Hyperides to plead; for which purpose they took their ballots from the altar, and not a single ballot was given for this wretch. To prove the truth of my statements call me the witnesses.

WITNESSES

"We, Callias of Sunium, Zenon of Phlyus, Cleon of Phalerum, Demonicus of Marathon, testify for Demosthenes in the name of all, that, the people having formerly elected Æschines for their advocate before the Amphictyons on the question of the Delián temple, we in council determined that Hyperides was more worthy to plead on behalf of the state, and Hyperides was commissioned."

Thus, by removing this man when he was about to plead, and appointing another, the council pronounced him a traitor and an enemy.

Such is one of this boy's political acts, similar—is it not?—to what he charges me with. Now let me remind you of another. When Philip sent Python of Byzantium, together with an embassy from all his own allies, with the intention of putting our commonwealth to shame, and proving her in the wrong, then—when Python swaggered and poured a flood of abuse upon you—I neither yielded nor gave way; I rose and answered him, and betrayed not the rights of the commonwealth. So plainly did I convict Philip of injustice that his very allies rose up and acknowledged it; while Æschines fought his battle, and bore witness, aye, false witness, against his own country.

Nor was this enough. Again, some time afterward, he was found meeting Anaxinus, the spy, at Thraso's house. A man, I say, who had a private meeting and conference with an emissary of the foe must himself have been a spy by nature and an enemy to his country. To prove these statements, call me the witnesses.

WITNESSES

"Teledemus, son of Cleon, Hyperides, son of Callæschrus, Nicomachus, son of Diophantus, testify for Demosthenes, as they swore before

the generals, that Æschines, son of Atrometus of Cothocidæ, did, to their knowledge, meet by night in Thraso's house, and confer with Anaxinus, who was adjudged to be a spy of Philip. These depositions were returned before Nicias, on the third of Hecatombæon."

A vast deal besides that I could say about him I omit. For thus (methinks) it is. I could produce many more such cases, where Æschines was discovered at that period assisting the enemy and harassing me. But these things are not treasured up by you for careful remembrance or proper resentment. You have, through evil custom, given large license to any one that chooses to supplant and calumniate your honest counselors, exchanging the interest of the state for the pleasure and gratification of hearing abuse; and so it is easier and safer always to be a hireling serving your enemies than a statesman attached to you.

That he should cooperate openly with Philip before the war was shocking—O heaven and earth! could it be otherwise?—against his country! Yet allow him, if you please, allow him this. But when the ships had openly been made prize, Chersonesus was ravaged, the man was marching against Attica, matters were no longer doubtful, war had begun—nothing that he ever did for you can this malicious iambic-mouther show—not a resolution has Æschines, great or small, concerning the interests of the state. If he assert it, let him prove it now while my water-glass is running. But there is none. He is reduced to an alternative: either he had no fault to find with my measures and therefore moved none against them, or he sought the good of the enemy and therefore would not propose any better.

Did he abstain from speaking as well as moving when any mischief was to be done to you? Why, no one else could speak a word. Other things, it appears, the country could endure, and he could accomplish without detection; but one last act he achieved, O Athenians, which crowned all he had done before; on which he lavished that multitude of words, recounting the decrees against the Amphissian Locrians in hopes of distorting the truth. But the thing admits it not. No! never will you wash yourself clean from your performances there—talk as long as you will!

In your presence, men of Athens, I invoke all the gods and goddesses to whom the Attic territory belongs, and Pythian Apollo, the father god of our state; and I implore them all! As I shall declare the truth to you, as I declared it in your assembly at the time, the very moment I saw this wretch putting his hand to the work—for I perceived, instantly perceived it—so may they grant me favor and protection! If from malice or personal rivalry I bring a false charge against my opponent, may they cut me off from every blessing!

But wherefore this imprecation, this solemn assurance? Because, though I have documents lying in the public archives, from which I shall clearly prove my assertions, though I know you remember the facts, I fear this man may be considered unequal to the mischiefs which he has wrought; as before happened, when he caused the destruction of the unhappy Phocians by his false reports to you.

The Amphissian war, I say—which brought Philip to Elatea, which caused him to be chosen general of the Amphictyons, which ruined everything in Greece—was this man's contrivance. He is the single author of all our heaviest calamities. I protested at the time, and cried out in the assembly: "You are bringing a war, Æschines, into Attica, an Amphictyonic war"—but his packed party would not let me be heard; the rest wondered, and supposed that I was bringing an idle charge against him out of personal enmity. However, the real character of those transactions, the purpose for which they were got up, the manner in which they were accomplished, hear ye now, men of Athens, as ye were prevented then. You will see that the thing was well concerted, and it will help you much to get a knowledge of public affairs, and what craftiness there was in Philip you will observe.

Philip could neither finish nor get rid of the war with Athens unless he made the Thebans and Thessalians her enemies. Though your generals fought against him without fortune or skill, yet from the war itself and the cruisers he suffered infinite damage. He could neither export any of the produce of his country nor import what he needed. He was not then superior to you at sea, nor able to reach Attica,

unless the Thessalians followed him and the Thebans gave him a passage; so that, while he overcame in war the generals whom you sent out—such as they were—I say nothing about that—he found himself distressed by the difference of your local position and means. Should he urge either Thessalians or Thebans to march in his own quarrel against you, none, he thought, would attend to him; but should he, under the pretense of taking up their common cause, be elected general, he trusted partly by deceit and partly by persuasion to gain his ends more easily. He sets to work, therefore—observe how cleverly—to get the Amphictyons into a war and create a disturbance in the congress. For this he thought they would immediately want him. Now, if any of the presbyters commissioned by himself or any of his allies brought it forward, he imagined that both Thebans and Thessalians would suspect the thing and would all be on their guard; whereas, if the agent were an Athenian and commissioned by you his opponents, it would easily pass unnoticed. And thus it turned out.

How did he effect his purpose? He hires the prosecutor. No one (I believe) was aware of the thing or attending to it, and so—just as these things are usually done at Athens—Æschines was proposed for Pylæan deputy, three or four held up their hands for him, and his election was declared. When, clothed with the dignity of the state, he arrived among the Amphictyons, dismissing and disregarding all besides, he hastened to execute what he was hired for. He makes up a pretty speech and story, showing how the Cirrhæan plain came to be consecrated; reciting this to the presbyters, men unused to speeches and unsuspicious of any consequences, he procures a vote from them to walk round the district, which the Amphissians maintained they had a right to cultivate, but which he charged to be parcel of the sacred plain. The Locrians were not then instituting any suit against us, or any such proceeding as Æschines now falsely alleges. This will show you it was impossible (I fancy) for the Locrians to carry on process against our commonwealth without a citation. Who summoned us then? In whose archonship? Say who knows—point him out. You cannot. Your pretense was flimsy and false.

When the Amphictyons at the instance of this man walked over the plain, the Locrians fell upon them and well-nigh speared them all; some of the presbyters they carried off captive. Complaints having followed, and war being stirred up against the Amphissians, at first Cottyphus led an army composed entirely of Amphictyons; but as some never came, and those that came did nothing, measures were taken against the ensuing congress by an instructed gang, the old traitors of Thessaly and other states, to get the command for Philip. And they had found a fair pretext: for it was necessary, they said, either to subsidize themselves and maintain a mercenary force and fine all recusants, or to elect him. What need of many words? He was thereupon chosen general; and immediately afterward collecting an army, and marching professedly against Cirrha, he bids a long farewell to the Cirrhæans and Locrians, and seizes Elatea. Had not the Thebans, upon seeing this, immediately changed their minds and sided with us, the whole thing would have fallen like a torrent upon our country. As it was, they for the instant stopped him; chiefly, O Athenians, by the kindness of some divinity to Athens, but secondly, as far as it could depend on a single man, through me. Give me those decrees, and the dates of the several transactions, that you may know what mischief this pestilent creature has stirred up with impunity. Read me the decrees.

THE DECREE OF THE AMPHICTYONS

"In the priesthood of Clinagoras, at the spring congress, it hath been resolved by the deputies and councilors of the Amphictyons, and by the assembly of the Amphictyons, seeing that the Amphissians trespass upon the sacred plain and sow and depasture it with cattle, that the deputies and councilors do enter thereupon and define the boundaries with pillars, and enjoin the Amphissians not to trespass for the future."

ANOTHER DECREE

"In the priesthood of Clinagoras, at the spring congress, it hath been resolved by the deputies and councilors of the Amphictyons and by the assembly of the Amphictyons, seeing that the people of Amphissa have partitioned among themselves the sacred plain and cultivate and feed cattle upon the same, and on being interrupted have come in arms,

and with force resisted the general council of the Greeks, and have wounded some of them; that Cottyphus, the Arcadian, who hath been elected general of the Amphictyons, be sent ambassador to Philip of Macedon, and do request him to come to the aid of Apollo and the Amphictyons, that he may not suffer the god to be insulted by the impious Amphissians; and do announce that the Greeks who are members of the Amphictyonic Council appoint him general with absolute powers."

Now read the dates of these transactions. They correspond with the time when Æschines was deputy. Read.

DATES

"Mnesithides archon, on the sixteenth of the month Anthesterion."

Now give me the letter which, when the Thebans would not hearken to Philip, he sends to his allies in Peloponnesus, that you may plainly see even from this how the true motives of his enterprise, his designs against Greece and the Thebans and yourselves were concealed by him, while he affected to be taking measures for the common good under a decree of the Amphictyons. The man who furnished him with these handles and pretexts was Æschines. Read.

THE LETTER OF PHILIP

"Philip, King of Macedon, to the magistrates and councilors of the confederate Peloponnesians and to all the other allies, greeting. Whereas, the Locrians surnamed Ozolian, dwelling in Amphissa, commit sacrilege against the temple of Apollo at Delphi, and coming with arms despoil the sacred plain, I propose, with your assistance, to avenge the god, and to chastise people who violate any part of our recognized religion. Wherefore meet me with arms in Phocis, bringing provisions for forty days, in the ensuing mónth of Lous, as we style it, Boedromion as the Athenians, Panemus as the Corinthians. Those who do not meet us with all their forces, we shall visit with punishment. Farewell."

You see, he avoids all private pleas and has recourse to an Amphictyonic. Who was it, I say, that helped him to this contrivance—that lent him these excuses? Who is most to blame for the misfortunes which have happened? Surely Æschines. Then go not about saying, "O Athenians, that one man has inflicted these calamities on Greece!" Heaven

and earth! It was not a single man, but a number of miscreants in every state. Æschines was one of them; and, were I obliged to speak the truth without reserve, I should not hesitate to call him the common pest of all that have since been ruined, men, places, cities: for whoever supplies the seed, to him the crop is owing. I marvel, indeed, you turned not your faces away the moment you beheld him. But there is a thick darkness, it seems, between you and the truth.

The mention of this man's treasonable acts brings me to the part which I have myself taken in opposition to him. It is fair you should hear my account of it for many reasons, but chiefly, men of Athens, because it would be a shame, when I have undergone the toil of exertions on your behalf, that you should not endure the bare recital of them.

When I saw that the Thebans, and I may add the Athenians, were so led away by Philip's partisans and the corrupt men of either state, as to disregard and take no precaution against a danger which menaced both and required the utmost precaution (I mean the suffering Philip's power to increase), and were readily disposed to enmity and strife with each other, I was constantly watchful to prevent it, not only because in my own judgment I deemed such vigilance expedient, but knowing that Aristophon, and again Eubulus, had all along desired to bring about that union, and, while they were frequently opposed upon other matters, were always agreed upon this. Men whom in their lifetime—you reptile!—you pestered with flattery, yet see not that you are accusing them in their graves; for the Theban policy that you reproach me with is a charge less affecting me than them who approved that alliance before I did. But I must return. I say, when Æschines had excited the war in Amphissa, and his coadjutors had helped to establish enmity with Thebes, Philip marched against us—that was the object for which these persons embroiled the states—and had we not roused up a little in time we could never have recovered ourselves; so far had these men carried matters. In what position you then stood to each other, you will learn from the recital of these decrees and answers. Here, take and read them.

DECREE

"In the archonship of Heropythus, on the twenty-fifth of the month Elaphebolion, in the presidency of the Erechtheian tribe, by the advice of the council and the generals: Whereas Philip hath taken possession of certain neighboring cities, and is besieging others, and, finally, is preparing to advance against Attica, setting our treaty at naught, and designs to break his oaths and the peace in violation of our common engagements; the council and people have resolved to send unto him ambassadors, who shall confer with him, and exhort him above all to maintain his relations of amity with us and his convention, or if not, to give time to the commonwealth for deliberation, and conclude an armistice until the month Thargelion. These have been chosen from the council: Simus of Anagyrus, Euthydemus of Phlyus, Bulagoras of Alopece."

ANOTHER DECREE

"In the archonship of Heropythus, on the last day of the month Munychion, by the advice of the Polemarch: Whereas Philip designs to put the Thebans at variance with us, and hath prepared to advance with his whole army to the places nearest to Attica, violating the engagements that subsist between us, the council and people have resolved to send unto him a herald and ambassadors, who shall request and call upon him to conclude an armistice, so that the people may take measures according to circumstances; for now they do not purpose to march out in the event of anything reasonable. Nearchus, son of Sosinomus, and Polycrates, son of Epiphron, have been chosen from the council; and for herald, Eunomus of Anaphlystus from the people."

Now read the answers:—

TO THE ATHENIANS

"Philip, King of Macedon, to the Council and People of Athens, greeting. Of the part which you have taken in reference to me from the beginning I am not ignorant, nor what exertions you are making to gain over the Thessalians and Thebans, and also the Bœotians. Since they are more prudent and will not submit their choice to your dictation, but stand by their own interest, you shift your ground, and, sending ambassadors and a herald to me, you talk of engagements and ask for an armistice, although I have given you no offense. However, I have given audience to your ambassadors, and I agree to your request and am ready to conclude an armistice if you will dismiss your evil counselors and degrade them as they deserve. Farewell."

TO THE THEBANS

"Philip, King of Macedon, to the Council and People of Thebes, greeting. I have received your letter wherein you renew peace and amity with me. I am informed, however, that the Athenians are most earnestly soliciting you to accept their overtures. I blamed you at first for being inclined to put faith in their promises and to espouse their policy. But since I have discovered that you would rather maintain peace with me than follow the counsels of others, I praise you the more on divers accounts, but chiefly because you have consulted in this business for your safety, and preserve your attachment to me, which I trust will be of no small moment to you if you persevere in that determination. Farewell."

Philip having thus disposed the states toward each other by his contrivances, and being elated by these decrees and answers, came with his army and seized Elatea, confident that, happen what might, you and the Thebans could never again unite. What commotion there was in the city you all know; but let me just mention the most striking circumstances.

It was evening. A person came with a message to the presidents that Elatea was taken. They rose from supper immediately, drove off the people from their market-stalls, and set fire to the wicker-frames; others sent for the generals and called the trumpeter, and the city was full of commotion. The next morning at daybreak the presidents summoned the council to their hall, and you went to the assembly, and before they could introduce or prepare the question, the whole people were up in their seats. When the council had entered, and the presidents had reported their intelligence and presented the courier, and he had made his statement, the crier asked: "Who wishes to speak?" and no one came forward. The crier put the question repeatedly—still no man rose, though all the generals were present and all the orators, and our country with her common voice called for some one to speak and save her—for when the crier raises his voice according to law, it may justly be deemed the common voice of our country. If those of greatest wealth, the three hundred—if those who were both friendly to the state and wealthy, the men who afterward gave such ample donations; for patriotism and wealth pro-

duced the gift—if those who desired the salvation of Athens were the proper parties to come forward, all of you and the other Athenians would have risen and mounted the platform; for I am sure you all desired her salvation. But that occasion, that day, as it seems, called not only for a patriot and a wealthy man, but for one who had closely followed the proceedings from their commencement, and rightly calculated for what object and purpose Philip carried them on. A man who was ignorant of these matters, or had not long and carefully studied them, let him be ever so patriotic or wealthy, would neither see what measures were needful, nor be competent to advise you.

Well, then, I was the man called for upon that day. I came forward and addressed you. What I said I beg you for two reasons attentively to hear; firstly, to be convinced that of all your orators and statesmen I alone deserted not the patriot's post in the hour of danger, but was found in the very moment of panic speaking and moving what your necessities required; secondly, because at the expense of a little time you will gain large experience for the future in all your political concerns.

I said those who were in such alarm under the idea that Philip had got the Thebans with him did not, in my opinion, understand the position of affairs; for I was sure, had that really been so, we should have heard not of his being at Elatea, but upon our frontiers; he was come, however, I knew for certain, to make all right for himself in Thebes. "Let me inform you," said I, "how the matter stands. All the Thebans whom it was possible either to bribe or deceive he has at his command; those who have resisted him from the first, and still oppose him, he can in no way prevail upon; what, then, is his meaning and why has he seized upon Elatea? He means, by displaying a force in the neighborhood, and bringing up his troops, to encourage and embolden his friends, to intimidate his adversaries, that they may either concede from fear what they now refuse, or be compelled. Now," said I, "if we determine on the present occasion to remember any unkindness which the Thebans have done us, and to regard them in the character of enemies with distrust, in the first place, we shall be doing just what Philip

would desire; in the next place, I fear his present adversaries embracing his friendship and all Philippizing with one consent, they will both march against Attica. But if you will hearken to me, and be pleased to examine (not cavil at) what I say, I believe it will meet your approval, and I shall dispel the danger impending over Athens. What, then, do I advise? First, away with your present fear; and rather fear all of ye for the Thebans; they are nearer harm than we are; to them the peril is more immediate. Next, I say, march to Eleusis all the fighting men and the cavalry, and show yourselves to the world in arms, that your partisans in Thebes may have equal liberty to speak up for the good cause, knowing that as the faction who sell their country to Philip have an army to support them at Elatea, so the party that will contend for freedom have your assistance at hand if they be assailed.

"Further, I recommend you to elect ten ambassadors and empower them in conjunction with the generals to fix the time for going there and for the out-march. When the ambassadors have arrived at Thebes, how do I advise that you should treat the matter? Pray attend particularly to this. Ask nothing of the Thebans (it would be dishonorable at this time); but offer to assist them if they require it, on the plea that they are in extreme danger, and we see the future better than they do. If they accept this offer and hearken to our counsels, so shall we have accomplished what we desire, and our conduct will look worthy of the state; should we miscarry, they will have themselves to blame for any error committed now, and we shall have done nothing dishonorable or mean."

This and more to the like effect I spoke, and left the platform. It was approved by all; not a word was said against me. Nor did I make the speech without moving, nor make the motion without undertaking the embassy, nor undertake the embassy without prevailing on the Thebans. From the beginning to the end, I went through it all; I gave myself entirely to your service to meet the dangers which encompassed Athens.

Produce me the decree which then passed. Now, Æschines, how would you have me describe you, and how my-

self, upon that day? Shall I call myself Batalus, your nickname of reproach, and you not even a hero of the common sort, but one of those upon the stage, Cresphontes or Creon, or the Œnomaus whom you execrably murdered once at Colyttus? Well, upon that occasion, I, the Batalus of Pæania, was more serviceable to the state than you, the Œnomaus of Cothocidæ. You were of no earthly use; I did everything which became a good citizen. Read the decree.

THE DECREE OF DEMOSTHENES

"In the archonship of Nausicles, in the presidency of the Æantian tribe, on the sixteenth of Scirophorion, Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, moved: Whereas, Philip, King of Macedon, hath in time past been violating the treaty of peace made between him and the Athenian people, in contempt of his oaths and those laws of justice which are recognized among all the Greeks, and hath been annexing unto himself cities that no way belong to him, and hath besieged and taken some which belong to the Athenians without any provocation by the people of Athens, and at the present time he is making great advances in cruelty and violence, forasmuch as in certain Greek cities he puts garrisons and overturns their constitution some he razes to the ground and sells the inhabitants for slaves, in some he replaces a Greek population with barbarians, giving them possession of the temples and sepulchres, acting in no way foreign to his own country or character, making an insolent use of his present fortune, and forgetting that from a petty and insignificant person he has come to be unexpectedly great; and the people of Athens, so long as they saw him annexing barbarian or private cities of their own, less seriously regarded the offense given to themselves, but now that they see Greek cities outraged and some destroyed, they think it would be monstrous and unworthy of their ancestral glory to look on while the Greeks are enslaved:

"Therefore it is resolved by the council and people of Athens, that having prayed and sacrificed to the gods and heroes who protect the Athenian city and territory, bearing in mind the virtue of their ancestors, who deemed it of greater moment to preserve the liberty of Greece than their own country, they will put two hundred ships to sea, and their admiral shall sail up into the straits of Thermopylæ, and their general and commander of horse shall march with the infantry and cavalry to Eleusis, and ambassadors shall be sent to the other Greeks, and first of all to the Thebans, because Philip is nearest their territory, and shall exhort them without dread of Philip to maintain their own independence and that of Greece at large, and assure them that the Athenian people,

not remembering any variance which has formerly arisen between the countries, will assist them with troops and money and weapons and arms, feeling that for them (being Greeks) to contend among themselves for the leadership is honorable, but to be commanded and deprived of the leadership by a man of foreign extraction is derogatory to the renown of the Greeks and the virtue of their ancestors; further, the people of Athens do not regard the people of Thebes as aliens either in blood or race; they remember also the benefits conferred by their ancestors upon the ancestors of the Thebans; for they restored the children of Hercules who were kept by the Peloponnesians out of their hereditary dominion, defeating in battle those who attempted to resist the descendants of Hercules; and we gave shelter to Œdipus and his comrades in exile; and many other kind and generous acts have been done by us to the Thebans: wherefore now also the people of Athens will not desert the interests of the Thebans and the other Greeks: And let a treaty be entered into with them for alliance and intermarriage, and oaths be mutually exchanged. Ambassadors: Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes of Pæania, Hyperides, son of Cleander of Spettus, Mnesithides, son of Antiphanes of Phrearrii, Democrates, son of Sophilus of Phlyus, Callæschrus, son of Diotimus of Cothocidæ."

That was the commencement and first step in the negotiation with Thebes; before then the countries had been led by these men into discord and hatred and jealousy. That decree caused the peril which then surrounded us to pass away like a cloud. It was the duty of a good citizen, if he had any better plan, to disclose it at the time, not to find fault now. A statesman and a pettifogger, while in no other respect are they alike, in this most widely differ. The one declares his opinion before the proceedings, and makes himself responsible to his followers, to fortune, to the times, to all men: the other is silent when he ought to speak; at any untoward event he grumbles.

Now, as I said before, the time for a man who regarded the commonwealth, and for honest counsel, was then. However, I will go to this extent—if any one now can point out a better course, or, indeed, if any other were practicable but the one which I adopted, I confess that I was wrong. For if there be any measure now discovered, which (executed then) would have been to our advantage, I say it ought not to have escaped me. But if there is none, if there was none, if none can be suggested even at this day, what was a states-

man to do? Was he not to choose the best measures within his reach and view? That did I, Æschines, when the crier asked, "Who wishes to speak?"—not, "Who wishes to complain about the past or to guarantee the future?" While you on those occasions sat mute in the assembly, I came forward and spake. However, as you omitted then, tell us now. Say, what scheme that I ought to have devised, what favorable opportunity was lost to the state by my neglect?—what alliance was there, what better plan, to which I should have directed the people? But no! The past is with all the world given up; no one even proposes to deliberate about it; the future it is, or the present which demands the action of a counselor. At the time, as it appeared, there were dangers impending, and dangers at hand. Mark the line of my policy at that crisis; don't rail at the event. The end of all things is what the Deity pleases; his line of policy it is that shows the judgment of the statesman. Do not then impute it as a crime to me that Philip chanced to conquer in battle: that issue depended not on me, but on God. Prove that I adopted not all measures that according to human calculation were feasible—that I did not honestly and diligently and with exertions beyond my strength carry them out—or that my enterprises were not honorable and worthy of the state, and necessary. Show me this, and accuse me as soon as you like. But if the hurricane that visited us hath been too powerful, not for us only, but for all Greece besides, what is the fair course? As if a merchant, after taking every precaution, and furnishing his vessel with everything that he thought would insure her safety, because afterward he met with a storm and his tackle was strained or broken to pieces, should be charged with the shipwreck! "Well, but I was not the pilot," he might say, just as I was not the general. "Fortune was not under my control; all was under hers."

Consider and reflect upon this: If, with the Thebans on our side, we were destined so to fare in the contest, what was to be expected, if we had never had them for allies, but they had joined Philip, as he used every effort of persuasion to make them do? And if, when the battle was fought three days' march from Attica, such peril and alarm surrounded

the city, what must we have expected, if the same disaster had happened in some part of our territory? As it was (do you see?), we could stand, meet, breathe; mightily did one, two, three days, help to our preservation. In the other case —but it is wrong to mention things of which we have been spared the trial by the favor of some deity, and by our protecting ourselves with the very alliance which you assail.

All this, at such length, have I addressed to you, men of the jury, and to the outer circle of hearers; for, as to this contemptible fellow, a short and plain argument would suffice.

If the future was revealed to you, Æschines, alone, when the state was deliberating on these proceedings, you ought to have forewarned us at the time. If you did not foresee it, you are responsible for the same ignorance as the rest. Why, then, do you accuse me in this behalf, rather than I you? A better citizen have I been than you in respect of the matters of which I am speaking (others I discuss not at present), inasmuch as I gave myself up to what seemed for the general good, not shrinking from any personal danger, nor taking thought of any; while you neither suggested better measures (or mine would not have been adopted), nor lent any aid in the prosecuting of mine, exactly what the basest person and worst enemy of the state would do, are you found to have done after the event; and at the same time Aristratus in Naxos and Aristolaus in Thasos, the deadly foes of our state, are bringing to trial the friends of Athens, and Æschines at Athens is accusing Demosthenes. Surely the man who waited to found his reputation upon the misfortunes of the Greeks deserves rather to perish than to accuse another; nor is it possible that one who has profited by the same conjunctures as the enemies of the commonwealth can be a well-wisher of his country. You show yourself by your life and conduct, by your political action, and even your political inaction. Is anything going on that appears good for the people? Æschines is mute. Has anything untoward happened or amiss? Forth comes Æschines; just as fractures and sprains are put in motion when the body is attacked by disease.

But since he insists so strongly on the event, I will even

assert something of a parodox; and I beg and pray of you not to marvel at its boldness, but kindly to consider what I say. If, then, the results had been foreknown to all, if all had foreseen them, and you, Æschines, had foretold them and protested with clamor and outcry—you that never opened your mouth—not even then should the commonwealth have abandoned her design, if she had any regard for glory, or ancestry, or futurity. As it is, she appears to have failed in her enterprise, a thing to which all mankind are liable, if the Deity so wills it; but then—claiming precedency over others, and afterward abandoning her pretensions—she would have incurred the charge of betraying all to Philip. Why, had we resigned without a struggle that which our ancestors encountered every danger to win, who would not have spit upon you? Let me not say, the commonwealth or myself! With what eyes, I pray, could we have beheld strangers visiting the city, if the result had been what it is, and Philip had been chosen leader and lord of all, but other people without us had made the struggle to prevent it; especially when in former times our country had never preferred an ignominious security to the battle for honor? For what Grecian or what barbarian is ignorant that by the Thebans, or by the Lacedæmonians who were in might before them, or by the Persian king, permission would thankfully and gladly have been given to our commonwealth, to take what she pleased and hold her own, provided she would accept foreign law and let another power command in Greece?

But, as it seems, to the Athenians of that day such conduct would not have been national, or natural, or endurable; none could at any period of time persuade the commonwealth to attach herself in secure subjection to the powerful and unjust; through every age has she persevered in a perilous struggle for precedency and honor and glory. And this you esteem so noble and congenial to your principles that among your ancestors you honor most those who acted in such a spirit; and with reason. For who would not admire the virtue of those men who resolutely embarked in their galleys and quitted country and home rather than receive foreign law, choosing Themistocles who gave such counsel for their

general, and stoning Cyrsilus to death who advised submission to the terms imposed—not him only, but your wives also stoning his wife? Yes, the Athenians of that day looked not for an orator or a general who might help them to a pleasant servitude: they scorned to live, if it could not be with freedom. For each of them considered that he was not born to his father or mother only, but also to his country. What is the difference? He that thinks himself born for his parents only, waits for his appointed or natural end; he that thinks himself born for his country also, will sooner perish than behold her in slavery, and will regard the insults and indignities, which must be borne in a commonwealth enslaved, as more terrible than death.

Had I attempted to say that I instructed you in sentiments worthy of your ancestors, there is not a man who would not justly rebuke me. What I declare is that such principles are your own. I show that before my time such was the spirit of the commonwealth; though certainly in the execution of the particular measures I claim a share also for myself. The prosecutor, arraigning the whole proceedings, and embittering you against me as the cause of our alarms and dangers, in his eagerness to deprive me of honor for the moment, robs you of the eulogies that should endure forever. For should you, under a disbelief in the wisdom of my policy, convict the defendant, you will appear to have done wrong, not to have suffered what befell you by the cruelty of fortune. But never, never can you have done wrong, O Athenians, in undertaking the battle for the freedom and safety of all! I swear it by your forefathers—those that met the peril at Marathon, those that took the field at Platæa, those in the sea fight at Salamis, and those at Artemisium, and many other brave men who repose in the public monuments, all of whom alike, as being worthy of the same honor, the country buried, Æschines, not only the successful or victorious! Justly! For the duty of brave men has been done by all: their fortune has been such as the Deity assigned to each.

Accursed scribbler! you, to deprive me of the approbation and affection of my countrymen, speak of trophies and battles and ancient deeds, with none of which had this pres-

ent trial the least concern; but I!—oh, you third-rate actor! —I, that rose to counsel the state how to maintain her pre-eminence! in what spirit was I to mount the hustings? In the spirit of one having unworthy counsel to offer?—I should have deserved to perish! You yourselves, men of Athens, may not try private and public causes on the same principles: the compacts of every-day life you are to judge of by particular laws and circumstances; the measures of statesmen, by reference to the dignity of your ancestors. And if you think it your duty to act worthily of them, you should every one of you consider, when you come into court to decide public questions, that, together with your staff and ticket, the spirit of the commonwealth is delivered to you.

But in touching upon the deeds of your ancestors, there were some decrees and transactions which I omitted. I will return from my digression.

On our arrival at Thebes we found ambassadors there from Philip, from the Thessalians and from his other allies; our friends in trepidation, his friends confident. To prove that I am not asserting this now to serve my own purposes, read me the letter which we ambassadors dispatched on the instant. So outrageous is my opponent's malignity, that, if any advantage was procured, he attributes it to the occasion, not to me; while all miscarriages he attributes to me and my fortune. And according to him, as it seems, I, the orator and adviser, have no merit in results of argument and counsel, but am the sole author of misfortunes in arms and strategy. Could there be a more brutal calumniator or a more execrable? Read the letter. [The letter is read.]

On the convening of the assembly, our opponents were introduced first, because they held the character of allies. And they came forward and spoke in high praise of Philip and disparagement of you, bringing up all the hostilities that you ever committed against the Thebans. In fine, they urged them to show their gratitude for the services done by Philip, and to avenge themselves for the injuries which you had done them, either—it mattered not which—by giving them a passage against you, or by joining in the invasion of Attica; and they proved, as they fancied, that by adopting their advice the cattle and slaves and other effects of Attica would come

into Bœotia, whereas by acting as they said we should advise, Bœotia would suffer pillage through the war. And much they said besides, tending all to the same point. The reply that we made I would give my life to recapitulate, but I fear, as the occasion is past, you will look upon it as if a sort of deluge had overwhelmed the whole proceedings, and regard any talk about them as a useless troubling of you. Hear, then, what we persuaded them and what answer they returned. Take and read this: [The answer of the Thebans is read.]

After this they invited and sent for you. You marched to their succor, and—to omit what happened between—their reception of you was so friendly that, while their infantry and cavalry were outside the walls, they admitted your army into their houses and citadel, among their wives and children and all that was most precious. Why, upon that day three of the noblest testimonies were before all mankind borne in your favor by the Thebans—one to your courage, one to your justice, one to your good behavior. For when they preferred fighting on your side to fighting against you, they held you to be braver and juster in your demands than Philip; and when they put under your charge what they and all men are most watchful to protect, their wives and children, they showed that they had confidence in your good behavior. In all which, men of Athens, it appeared they had rightly estimated your character. For after your forces entered the city, not so much as a groundless complaint was preferred against you by any one, so discreetly did you behave yourselves; and twice arrayed on their side in the earlier battles, that by the river and the winter battle, you proved yourselves not irreproachable only, but admirable in your discipline, your equipments, and your zeal, which called forth eulogies from other men to you, sacrifice and thanksgiving from you to the gods. And I would gladly ask Æschines—while these things were going on, and the city was full of enthusiasm and joy and praise, whether he joined with the multitude in sacrifice and festivity, or sat at home sorrowing and moaning and repining at the public success. For if he were present and appeared with the rest, is not his conduct monstrous, or rather impious, when measures, which he himself called the gods to

witness were excellent, he now requires you to condemn—you that have sworn by the gods? If he were not present, does he not deserve a thousand deaths for grieving to behold what others rejoiced at? Read me now the decrees. [The decrees for sacrifice are read.]

We thus were engaged in sacrifice; the Thebans were in the assurance that they had been saved through us, and it had come about that a people, who seemed likely to want assistance through the practices of these men, were themselves assisting others in consequence of my advice which you followed. What language Philip then uttered, and in what trouble he was on this account, you shall learn from his letters which he sent to Peloponnesus. Take and read them, that the jury may know what my perseverance and journey and toils and the many decrees which this man just now pulled to pieces accomplished.

Athenians, you have had many great and renowned orators before me: the famous Callistratus, Aristophon, Cephalus, Thrasybulus, hundreds of others; yet none of them ever thoroughly devoted himself to any measure of state; for instance, the mover of a resolution would not be ambassador; the ambassador would not move a resolution; each one left for himself some relief, and also, should anything happen, an excuse. How, then, it may be said, did you so far surpass others in might and boldness as to do everything yourself? I don't say that; but such was my conviction of the danger impending over us that I considered it left no room or thought for individual security; a man should have been only too happy to perform his duty without neglect. As to myself, I was persuaded, perhaps foolishly, yet I was persuaded, that none would move better resolutions than myself, none would execute them better, none as ambassador would show more zeal and honesty. Therefore I undertook every duty myself. Read the letters of Philip. [The letters are read.]

To this did my policy, Æschines, reduce Philip. This language he uttered through me, he that before had lifted his voice so boldly against Athens! For which I was justly crowned by the people; and you were present and opposed it not, and Diondas who preferred an indictment obtained

not his share of the votes. Here, read me the decrees which were then absolved, and which this man never indicted. [The decrees are read.]

These decrees, men of Athens, contain the very words and syllables which Aristonicus drew up formerly, and Ctesiphon the defendant has now. And Æschines neither arraigned these himself nor aided the party who preferred an indictment. Yet, if his present charge against me be true, he might then have arraigned Demomeles, the mover, and Hyperides with more show of reason than he can the defendant. Why? Because Ctesiphon may refer to them, and to the decisions of the courts, and to the fact of Æschines not having accused them, although they moved the same decrees which he has now, and to the laws which bar any further proceedings in such a case, and to many points besides: whereas then the question would have been tried on its own merits before any such advantages had been obtained. But then, I imagine, it would have been impossible to do what Æschines now does—to pick out of a multitude of old dates and decrees what no man knew before, and what no man would have expected to hear to-day, for the purpose of slander—to transpose dates and assign measures to the wrong causes instead of the right, in order to make a plausible case. That was impossible then. Every statement must have been according to the truth, soon after the facts, while you still remembered the particulars and had them almost at your fingers' ends. Therefore it was he that shunned all investigation at the time and has come at this late period; thinking, as it appears to me, that you would make it a contest of orators instead of an inquiry into political conduct; that words would be criticised, and not interests of state.

Then he plays the sophist, and says you ought to disregard the opinion of us which you came from home with —that, as when you audit a man's account under the impression that he has a surplus, if it cast up right and nothing remain, you allow it, so should you now accept the fair conclusion of the argument. Only see how rotten in its nature (and justly so) is every wicked contrivance! For by this very cunning simile he has now acknowledged it to be your conviction that I am my country's advocate and he

is Philip's. Had not this been your opinion of each he would not have tried to persuade you differently. That he has, however, no reasonable ground for requiring you to change your belief, I can easily show, not by casting accounts —for that mode of reckoning applies not to measures—but by calling the circumstances briefly to mind, taking you that hear me both for auditors and witnesses.

Through my policy which he arraigns, instead of the Thebans invading this country with Philip, as all expected, they joined our ranks and prevented him; instead of the war being in Attica, it took place seven hundred furlongs from the city on the confines of Bœotia; instead of corsairs issuing from Eubœa to plunder us, Attica was in peace on the coast-side during the whole war; instead of Philip being master of the Hellespont by taking Byzantium, the Byzantines were our auxiliaries against him. Does this computation of services, think you, resemble the casting of accounts? Or should we strike these out on a balance and not look that they be kept in everlasting remembrance? I will not set down that of the cruelty, remarkable in cases where Philip got people all at once into his power, others have had the trial; while of the generosity, which, casting about for his future purposes, he assumed toward Athens, you have happily enjoyed the fruits. I pass that by.

Yet this I do not hesitate to say: that any one desirous of truly testing an orator, not of calumniating him, would never have made the charges that you advanced just now, inventing similes, mimicking words and gestures; (doubtless it hath determined the fortune of Greece whether I spoke this word or that, whether I moved my hand one way or the other!) no! he would have examined the facts of the case, what means and resources our country possessed when I entered on the administration; what, when I applied myself to it, I collected for her, and what was the condition of our adversaries. Then, if I had lessened her resources he would have shown me to be guilty; if I had greatly increased them he would not have calumniated me. However, as you have declined this course I will adopt it. See if I state the case fairly.

For resources, our country possessed the islanders—not

all, but the weakest, for neither Chios, nor Rhodes, nor Corcyra was with us; subsidies she had amounting to five-and-forty talents, and they were anticipated; infantry or cavalry, none besides the native. But what was most alarming and wrought most in favor of the enemy, these men had got all our neighbors to be hostile rather than friendly to us —Megarians, Thebans, Eubœans. Such were the circumstances of our state; no man can say anything to the contrary; look now at those of Philip, whom we had to contend with. In the first place, he ruled his followers with unlimited sway, the most important thing for military operations; in the next place, they had arms always in their hands; besides, he had plenty of money and did what he pleased, not giving notice by decrees, not deliberating openly, not brought to trial by calumniators, not defending indictments for illegal measures, not responsible to any one, but himself absolute master, leader, and lord of all. I, who was matched against him—for it is right to examine this—what had I under my control? Nothing. Public speech, for instance, the only thing open to me—even to this you invited his hirelings as well as myself; and whenever they prevailed over me (as often happened for some cause or other), your resolutions were passed for the enemy's good. Still, under these disadvantages, I got you for allies Eubœans, Achæans, Corinthians, Thebans, Megarians, Leucadians, Corcyræans, from whom were collected fifteen thousand mercenaries and two thousand horse, besides the national troops. Of money, too, I procured as large a contribution as possible.

If you talk about just conditions with the Thebans, Æschines, or with the Byzantines or Eubœans, or discuss now the question of equal terms, first, I say, you are ignorant that of those galleys formerly which defended Greece, being three hundred in number, our commonwealth furnished two hundred, and never (as it seemed) thought herself injured by having done so, never prosecuted those who advised it or expressed any dissatisfaction—shame on her if she had!—but was grateful to the gods, that when a common danger beset the Greeks, she alone furnished double what the rest did for the preservation of all. Besides, it is but a poor favor you do your countrymen by calumniating me. For

what is the use of telling us now what we should have done? Why, being in the city and present, did you not make your proposals then; if, indeed, they were practicable at a crisis when we had to accept not what we liked, but what the circumstances allowed? Remember, there was one ready to bid against us, to welcome eagerly those that we rejected, and give money into the bargain.

But if I am accused for what I have actually done, how would it have been, if, through my hard bargaining, the states had gone off and attached themselves to Philip, and he had become master at the same time of Eubœa, Thebes, and Byzantium? What, think ye, these impious men would have said or done? Said, doubtless, that the states were abandoned—that they wished to join us and were driven away—that he had got command of the Hellespont by the Byzantines, and become master of the corn trade of Greece —that a heavy neighbor war had by means of the Thebans been brought into Attica—that the sea had become unnavigable by the excursion of pirates from Eubœa! All this would they have said sure enough, and a great deal besides. A wicked, wicked thing, O Athenians, is a calumniator always, every way spiteful and fault-finding. But this creature is a reptile by nature, that from the beginning never did anything honest or liberal; a very ape of a tragedian, village Œnomaus, counterfeit orator! What advantage has your eloquence been to your country? Now do you speak to us about the past? As if a physician should visit his patients, and not order or prescribe anything to cure the disease, but on the death of any one, when the last ceremonies were performing, should follow him to the grave and expound, how, if the poor fellow had done this and that, he never would have died! Idiot! do you speak now?

Even the defeat—if you exult in that which should make you groan, you accursed one!—by nothing that I have done will it appear to have befallen us. Consider it thus, O Athenians, From no embassy on which I was commissioned by you did I ever come away defeated by the ambassadors of Philip—neither from Thessaly, nor from Ambracia, nor from the kings of Thrace, nor from Byzantium, nor from any other place, nor on the last recent occasion from Thebes;

but where his ambassadors were vanquished in argument, he came with arms and carried the day. And for this you call me to account, and are not ashamed to jeer the same person for cowardice, whom you require single-handed to overcome the might of Philip—and that too by words! For what else had I at my command? Certainly not the spirit of each individual, nor the fortune of the army, nor the conduct of the war, for which you would make me accountable; such a blunderer are you!

You understand me. Of what a statesman may be responsible for, I allow the utmost scrutiny; I deprecate it not. What are his functions? To observe things in the beginning, to foresee and foretell them to others—this I have done. Again, wherever he finds delays, backwardness, ignorance, jealousies, vices inherent and unavoidable in all communities, to contract them into the narrowest compass, and, on the other hand, to promote unanimity and friendship and zeal in the discharge of duty. All this, too, I have performed; and no one can discover the least neglect on my part. Ask any man by what means Philip achieved most of his successes, and you will be told by his army and by his bribing and corrupting men in power. Well; your forces were not under my command or control; so that I cannot be questioned for anything done in that department. But by refusing the price of corruption I have overcome Philip; for as the offerer of a bribe, if it be accepted, has vanquished the taker, so the person who refuses it and is not corrupted has vanquished the person offering. Therefore is the commonwealth undefeated as far as I am concerned.

These, and such as these (besides many others), are the grounds furnished by myself to justify the defendant's motion in my behalf. Those which you, my fellow citizens, furnished, I will proceed to mention. Immediately after the battle, the people, knowing and having witnessed everything which I did, in the very midst of their alarm and terror, when it would not have been surprising if the great body of them had even treated me harshly, passed my resolutions for the safety of the country; all their measures of defense, the disposition of the garrisons, the trenches, the levies for our fortifications, were carried on under my decrees; and further,

upon the election of a commissioner of grain, they chose me in preference to all. Afterward, when those who were bent to do me a mischief conspired and brought indictments, audits, impeachments, and the rest of it against me, not at first in their own persons, but in such names as they imagined would most effectually screen themselves (for you surely know and remember that every day of that first period I was arraigned, and neither the desperation of Sosicles, nor the malignity of Philocrates, nor the madness of Diondas and Melantus, nor anything else was left untried by them against me); on all those occasions, chiefly through the gods, secondly through you and the other Athenians, I was preserved. And with justice! Yes, that is the truth, and to the honor of the juries who so conscientiously decided. Well, then: on the impeachments, when you acquitted me and gave not the prosecutors their share of the votes, you pronounced that my policy was the best; by my acquittal on the indictments, my counsels and motion were shown to be legal; by your passing of my accounts, you acknowledged my whole conduct to have been honest and incorruptible. Under these circumstances, what name could Ctesiphon with decency or justice give to my acts? [What could he give if not] that which he saw the people give, which he saw the jurors give, which he saw truth establish to the world?

Aye, says he, that was a fine thing of Cephalus, never to have been indicted. Yes, and a lucky one, too. But why should a man, who has often been charged, but never convicted of crime, be a whit the more liable to reproach? However, men of Athens, against my opponent I have a right to use the boast of Cephalus, for he never preferred or prosecuted any indictment against me; therefore I am a citizen as good as Cephalus, by his admission.

From many things one may see his unfeelingness and malignity, but especially from his discourse about fortune. For my part, I regard any one who reproaches his fellow man with fortune as devoid of sense. He that is best satisfied with his condition, he that deems his fortune excellent, cannot be sure that it will remain so until the evening; how, then, can it be right to bring it forward, or upbraid another man with it? As Æschines, however, has on this subject

(besides many others) expressed himself with insolence, look, men of Athens, and observe how much more truth and humanity there shall be in my discourse upon fortune than in his.

I hold the fortune of our commonwealth to be good, and so I find the oracles of Dodonæan Jupiter and Pythian Apollo declaring to us. The fortune of all mankind, which now prevails, I consider cruel and dreadful: for what Greek, what barbarian, has not in these times experienced a multitude of evils? That Athens chose the noblest policy, that she fares better than those very Greeks who thought if they abandoned us they should abide in prosperity, I reckon as part of her good fortune: if she suffered reverses, if all happened not to us as we desired, I conceive she has had that share of the general fortune which fell to our lot. As to my fortune (personally speaking) or that of any individual among us, it should, as I conceive, be judged of in connection with personal matters. Such is my opinion upon the subject of fortune, a right and just one, as it appears to me, and I think you will agree with it. Æschines says that my individual fortune is paramount to that of the commonwealth, the small and mean to the good and great. How can this possibly be?

However, if you are determined, Æschines, to scrutinize my fortune, compare it with your own, and, if you find my fortune better than yours, cease to revile it. Look, then, from the very beginning. And I pray and entreat that I may not be condemned for bad taste. I do not think any person wise who insults poverty, or who prides himself on having been bred in affluence; but by the slander and malice of this cruel man I am forced into such a discussion, which I will conduct with all the moderation which circumstances allow.

I had the advantage, Æschines, in my boyhood, of going to proper schools and having such allowance as a boy should have who is to do nothing mean from indigence. Arrived at man's estate I lived suitably to my breeding; was choir master, ship commander, rate payer; backward in no acts of liberality, public or private, but making myself useful to the commonwealth and to my friends. When I entered upon

state affairs, I chose such a line of politics that both by my country and many people of Greece I have been crowned many times, and not even you, my enemies, venture to say that the line I chose was not honorable. Such, then, has been the fortune of my life. I could enlarge upon it, but I forbear, lest what I pride myself in should give offense.

But you, the man of dignity, who spit upon others, look what sort of fortune is yours compared with mine. As a boy you were reared in abject poverty, waiting with your father on the school, grinding the ink, sponging the benches, sweeping the room, doing the duty of a menial rather than a freeman's son. After you were grown up you attended your mother's initiations, reading her books and helping in all the ceremonies; at night wrapping the novitiates in fawn skin, swilling, purifying, and scouring them with clay and bran, raising them after the lustration, and bidding them say, "Bad I have scaped, and better I have found"; priding yourself that no one ever howled so lustily—and I believe him! for do not suppose that he who speaks so loud is not a splendid howler! In the daytime you led your noble orgiasts, crowned with fennel and poplar, through the highways, squeezing the big-cheeked serpents and lifting them over your head, and shouting Evœ Saboe, and capering to the words Hyes Attes, Attes Hyes, saluted by the beldames as leader, conductor, chest bearer, fan bearer, and the like, getting as your reward tarts and biscuits and rolls; for which any man might well bless himself and his fortune.

When you were enrolled among your fellow townsmen—by what means I stop not to inquire—when you were enrolled, however, you immediately selected the most honorable of employments, that of clerk and assistant to our petty magistrates. From this you were removed after a while, having done yourself all that you charge others with; and then, sure enough, you disgraced not your antecedents by your subsequent life, but hiring yourself to those ranting players, as they were called, Simylus and Socrates, you acted third parts, collecting figs and grapes and olives like a fruiterer from other men's farms, and getting more from them than from the playing, in which the lives of your whole company were at stake, for there was an implacable and

incessant war between them and the audience, from whom you received so many wounds, that no wonder you taunt as cowards people inexperienced in such encounters.

But passing over what may be imputed to poverty, I will come to the direct charges against your character. You espoused such a line of politics (when at last you thought of taking to them), that, if your country prospered, you lived the life of a hare, fearing and trembling and ever expecting to be scourged for the crimes of which your conscience accused you, though all have seen how bold you were during the misfortunes of the rest. A man who took courage at the death of a thousand citizens—what does he deserve at the hands of the living? A great deal more that I could say about him I shall omit; for it is not all I can tell of his turpitude and infamy which I ought to let slip from my tongue, but only what is not disgraceful to myself to mention.

Contrast now the circumstances of your life and mine, gently and with temper, Æschines, and then ask these people whose fortune they would each of them prefer. You taught reading, I went to school; you performed initiations, I received them; you danced in the chorus, I furnished it; you were assembly clerk, I was a speaker; you acted third parts, I heard you; you broke down, and I hissed; you have worked as a statesman for the enemy, I for my country. I pass by the rest; but this very day I am on my probation for a crown, and am acknowledged to be innocent of all offense, while you are already judged to be a pettifogger, and the question is, whether you shall continue that trade or at once be silenced by not getting a fifth part of the votes. A happy fortune, do you see, you have enjoyed, that you should denounce mine as miserable!

Come, now, let me read the evidence to the jury of public services which I have performed. And by way of comparison do you recite me the verses which you murdered:—

"From Hades and the dusky realms I come."

And

"Ill news, believe me, I am loth to bear."

Ill betide thee, say I, and may the gods, or at least the Athenians, confound thee for a vile citizen and a vile third-rate actor!

Read the evidence. [The evidence is read.]

Such has been my character in political matters. In private, if you do not all know that I have been liberal and humane and charitable to the distressed, I am silent; I will say not a word; I will offer no evidence on the subject, either of persons whom I ransomed from the enemy, or of persons whose daughters I helped to portion, or anything of the kind. For this is my maxim. I hold that the party receiving an obligation should ever remember it, the party conferring should forget it immediately, if the one is to act with honesty, the other without meanness. To remind and speak of your own bounties is next door to reproaching. I will not act so; nothing shall induce me. Whatever my reputation is in these respects, I am content with it.

I will have done, then, with private topics, but say another word or two upon public. If you can mention, Æschines, a single man under the sun, whether Greek or barbarian, who has not suffered by Philip's power formerly and Alexander's now, well and good; I concede to you that my fortune, or misfortune (if you please), has been the cause of everything. But if many that never saw me or heard my voice have been grievously afflicted, not individuals only, but whole cities and nations, how much juster and fairer is it to consider that to the common fortune apparently of all men, to a tide of events overwhelming and lamentable, these disasters are to be attributed. You, disregarding all this, accuse me whose ministry has been among my countrymen, knowing all the while that a part (if not the whole) of your calumny falls upon the people, and yourself in particular. For if I assumed the sole and absolute direction of our counsels, it was open to you, the other speakers, to accuse me; but if you were constantly present in all the assemblies, if the state invited public discussion of what was expedient, and if these measures were then believed by all to be the best, and especially by you (for certainly from no good-will did you leave me in possession of hopes and admiration and honors, all of which attended on my policy, but doubtless because you were

compelled by the truth and had nothing better to advise), is it not iniquitous and monstrous to complain now of measures, than which you could suggest none better at the time?

Among all other people I find these principles in a manner defined and settled—Does a man willfully offend? He is the object of wrath and punishment. Hath a man erred unintentionally? There is pardon instead of punishment for him. Has a man devoted himself to what seemed for the general good, and without any fault or misconduct been in common with all disappointed of success? Such a one deserves not obloquy or reproach, but sympathy. These principles will not be found in our statutes only: Nature herself has defined them by her unwritten laws and the feelings of humanity. Æschines, however, has so far surpassed all men in brutality and malignity, that even things which he cited himself as misfortunes he imputes to me as crimes.

And besides—as if he himself had spoken everything with candor and good-will—he told you to watch me, and mind that I did not cajole and deceive you, calling me a great orator, a juggler, a sophist, and the like; as though, if a man say of another what applies to himself, it must be true, and the hearers are not to inquire who the person is that makes the charge. Certain am I that you are all acquainted with my opponent's character, and believe these charges to be more applicable to him than to me. And of this I am sure, that my oratory—let it be so: though, indeed, I find that the speaker's power depends for the most part on the hearers; for according to your reception and favor it is that the wisdom of a speaker is esteemed—if I, however, possess any ability of this sort, you will find it has been exhibited always in public business on your behalf, never against you or on personal matters; whereas that of Æschines has been displayed not only in speaking for the enemy, but against all persons who ever offended or quarreled with him. It is not for justice or the good of the commonwealth that he employs it. A citizen of worth and honor should not call upon judges impaneled in the public service to gratify his anger or hatred or anything of that kind; nor should he come before you upon such grounds. The best

thing is not to have these feelings; but, if it cannot be helped, they should be mitigated and restrained.

On what occasions ought an orator and statesman to be vehement? Where any of the commonwealth's main interests are in jeopardy, and he is opposed to the adversaries of the people. Those are the occasions for a generous and brave citizen. But for a person who never sought to punish me for any offense, either public or private, on the state's behalf or on his own, to have got up an accusation because I am crowned and honored, and to have expended such a multitude of words—this is a proof of personal enmity and spite and meanness, not of anything good. And then his leaving the controversy with me, and attacking the defendant, comprises everything that is base.

I should conclude, Æschines, that you undertook this cause to exhibit your eloquence and strength of lungs, not to obtain satisfaction for any wrong. But it is not the language of an orator, Æschines, that has any value, nor yet the tone of his voice, but his adopting the same views with the people, and his hating and loving the same persons that his country does. He that is thus minded will say everything with loyal intention; he that courts persons from whom the commonwealth apprehends danger to herself rides not on the same anchorage with the people, and, therefore, has not the same expectation of safety. But—do you see?—I have: for my objects are the same with those of my countrymen; I have no interest separate or distinct. Is that so with you? How can it be—when immediately after the battle you went as ambassador to Philip, who was at that period the author of your country's calamities, notwithstanding that you had before persisted in refusing that office, as all men know?

And who is it that deceives the state? Surely the man who speaks not what he thinks. On whom does the crier pronounce a curse? Surely on such a man. What greater crime can an orator be charged with than that his opinions and his language are not the same? Such is found to be your character. And yet you open your mouth, and dare to look these men in the faces! Do you think they don't know you?—or are sunk all in such slumber and oblivion as

not to remember the speeches which you delivered in the assembly, cursing and swearing that you had nothing to do with Philip, and that I brought that charge against you out of personal enmity, without foundation? No sooner came the news of the battle than you forgot all that; you acknowledged and avowed that between Philip and yourself there subsisted a relation of hospitality and friendship—new names these for your contract of hire. For upon what plea of equality or justice could Æschines, son of Glaucothea the timbrel player, be the friend or acquaintance of Philip, I cannot see. No! You were hired to ruin the interests of your countrymen; and yet, though you yourself have been caught in open treason, and been informed against yourself after the fact, you revile and reproach me for things which you will find any man is chargeable with sooner than I.

Many great and glorious enterprises has the commonwealth, Æschines, undertaken and succeeded in through me; and she did not forget them. Here is the proof. On the election of a person to speak the funeral oration immediately after the event, you were proposed, but the people would not have you, notwithstanding your fine voice, nor Demades, though he had just made the peace, nor Hegemon, nor any other of your party—but me. And when you and Pythocles came forward in a brutal and shameful manner (O merciful heaven!) and urged the same accusations against me which you now do, and abused me, they elected me all the more. The reason—you are not ignorant of it—yet I will tell you. The Athenians knew as well the loyalty and zeal with which I conducted their affairs, as the dishonesty of you and your party; for what you denied upon oath in our prosperity, you confessed in the misfortunes of the republic. They considered, therefore, that men who got security for their politics by the public disasters had been their enemies long before, and were then avowedly such. They thought it right, also, that the person who was to speak in honor of the fallen and celebrate their valor should not have sat under the same roof or at the same table with their antagonists; that he should not revel there and sing a pæan over the calamities of Greece in company with their murderers, and then come here and receive distinction; that he

should not with his voice act the mourner of their fate, but that he should lament over them with his heart. This they perceived in themselves and in me, but not in any of you; therefore they elected me, and not you. Nor, while the people felt thus, did the fathers and brothers of the deceased, who were chosen by the people to perform their obsequies, feel differently. For having to order the funeral banquet (according to custom) at the house of the nearest relative to the deceased, they ordered it at mine. And with reason: because, though each to his own was nearer of kin than I was, none was so near to them all collectively. He that had the deepest interest in their safety and success had upon their mournful disaster the largest share of sorrow for them all.

Read him this epitaph, which the state chose to inscribe on their monument, that you may see even by this, Æschines, what a heartless and malignant wretch you are. Read.

> "These are the patriot brave, who side by side
> Stood to their arms, and dash'd the foeman's pride;
> Firm in their valor, prodigal of life,
> Hades they chose the arbiter of strife;
> That Greeks might ne'er to haughty victors bow,
> Nor thraldom's yoke, nor dire oppression know;
> They fought, they bled, and on their country's breast
> (Such was the doom of heaven) these warriors rest.
> Gods never lack success, nor strive in vain,
> But man must suffer what the fates ordain."

Do you hear, Æschines, in this very inscription, that "gods never lack success, nor strive in vain"? Not to the statesman does it ascribe the power of giving victory in battle, but to the gods. Wherefore, then, execrable man, do you reproach me with these things? Wherefore utter such language? I pray that it may fall upon the heads of you and yours!

Many other accusations and falsehoods he urged against me, O Athenians, but one thing surprised me more than all, that, when he mentioned the late misfortunes of the country, he felt not as became a well-disposed and upright citizen; he shed no tear, experienced no such emotion; with a loud voice

exulting, and straining his throat, he imagined apparently that he was accusing me, while he was giving proof against himself that our distresses touched him not in the same manner as the rest. A person who pretends, as he did, to care for the laws and constitution, ought at least to have this about him, that he grieves and rejoices for the same cause as the people, and not by his politics to be enlisted in the ranks of the enemy, as Æschines has plainly done, saying that I am the cause of all, and that the commonwealth has fallen into troubles through me, when it was not owing to my views or principles that you began to assist the Greeks; for, if you conceded this to me, that my influence caused you to resist the subjugation of Greece, it would be a higher honor than any that you have bestowed upon others. I myself would not make such an assertion—it would be doing you injustice—nor would you allow it, I am sure; and Æschines, if he acted honestly, would never, out of enmity to me, have disparaged and defamed the greatest of your glories.

But why do I censure him for this when with calumny far more shocking has he assailed me? He that charges me with Philippizing—O heaven and earth!—what would he not say? By Hercules and the gods! if one had honestly to inquire, discarding all expression of spite and falsehood, who the persons really are on whom the blame of what has happened may by common consent fairly and justly be thrown, it would be found they are persons in the various states like Æschines, not like me—persons who, while Philip's power was feeble and exceedingly small, and we were constantly warning and exhorting and giving salutary counsel, sacrificed the general interests for the sake of selfish lucre, deceiving and corrupting their respective countrymen, until they made them slaves—Daochus, Cineas, Thrasylaus, the Thessalians; Cercidas, Hieronymus, Eucampidas, the Arcadians; Myrtis, Teledamus, Mnaseas, the Argives; Euxitheus, Cleotimus, Aristæchmus, the Eleans; Neon and Thrasylochus, sons of the accursed Philiades, the Messenians; Aristratus, Epichares, the Sicyonians; Dinarchus, Demaratus, the Corinthians; Ptœodorus, Helixus, Perilaus, the Megarians; Timolaus, Theogiton, Anemœtas, the Thebans; Hipparchus, Clitarchus, Sosistratus, the Eubœans. The day will not last me to re-

count the names of the traitors. All these, O Athenians, are men of the same politics in their own countries as this party among you—profligates and parasites and miscreants, who have each of them crippled their fatherlands; toasted away their liberty, first to Philip and last to Alexander; who measure happiness by their belly and all that is base, while freedom and independence, which the Greeks of olden time regarded as the test and standard of well-being, they have annihilated.

Of this base and infamous conspiracy and profligacy—or rather, O Athenians, if I am to speak in earnest, of this betrayal of Grecian liberty—Athens is by all mankind acquitted, owing to my counsels; and I am acquitted by you. Then do you ask me, Æschines, for what merit I claim to be honored? I will tell you. Because, while all the statesmen in Greece, beginning with yourself, have been corrupted formerly by Philip and now by Alexander, me neither opportunity, nor fair speeches, nor large promises, nor hope, nor fear, nor anything else, could tempt or induce to betray aught that I considered just and beneficial to my country. Whatever I have advised my fellow citizens, I have never advised like you men, leaning as in a balance to the side of profit; all my proceedings have been those of a soul upright, honest, and incorrupt; entrusted with affairs of greater magnitude than any of my contemporaries, I have administered them all honestly and faithfully. Therefore do I claim to be honored.

As to this fortification, for which you ridiculed me, of the wall and fosse, I regard them as deserving of thanks and praise, and so they are; but I place them nowhere near my acts of administration. Not with stones nor with bricks did I fortify Athens, nor is this the ministry on which I most pride myself. Would you view my fortifications aright, you will find arms and states and posts and harbors and galleys and horses and men for their defense. These are the bulwarks with which I protected Attica as far as was possible by human wisdom; with these I fortified our territory, not the circle of Piræus or the city. Nay, more; I was not beaten by Philip in estimates or preparations; far from it; but the generals and forces of the allies were overcome by his for-

tune. Where are the proofs of this? They are plain and evident. Consider.

What was the course becoming a loyal citizen—a statesman serving his country with all possible forethought and zeal and fidelity? Should he not have covered Attica on the seaboard with Eubœa, on the midland frontier with Bœotia, on the Peloponnesian with the people of that confine? Should he not have provided for the conveyance of corn along a friendly coast all the way to Piræus? preserved certain places that belonged to us by sending off succors, and by advising and moving accordingly—Proconnesus, Chersonesus, Tenedos? brought others into alliance and confederacy with us—Byzantium, Abydos, Eubœa? cut off the principal resources of the enemy, and supplied what the commonwealth was deficient in? All this has been accomplished by my decrees and measures; and whoever will examine them without prejudice, men of Athens, will find they were rightly planned and faithfully executed; that none of the proper seasons were lost or missed or thrown away by me; nothing which depended on one man's ability and prudence was neglected. But if the power of some deity or fortune, or the worthlessness of commanders, or the wickedness of you that betrayed your countries, or all these things together, injured and eventually ruined our cause, of what is Demosthenes guilty? Had there been in each of the Greek cities one such man as I was in my station among you, or, rather, had Thessaly possessed one single man, and Arcadia one, of the same sentiments as myself, none of the Greeks either beyond or within Thermopylæ would have suffered their present calamities; all would have been free and independent, living prosperously in their own countries with perfect safety and security, thankful to you and the rest of the Athenians for such manifold blessings through me.

To show you that I greatly understate my services for fear of giving offense, here—read me this—the list of auxiliaries procured by my decrees. [The list is read.]

These and the like measures, Æschines, are what become an honorable citizen (by their success—O earth and heaven! —we should have been the greatest of people incontestably, and deserved to be so; even under their failure the result is

glory, and no one blames Athens or her policy: all condemn fortune that so ordered things); but never will he desert the interests of the commonwealth, nor hire himself to her adversaries, and study the enemy's advantage instead of his country's; nor, on a man who has courage to advise and propose measures worthy of the state, and resolution to persevere in them, will he cast an evil eye, and, if any one privately offend him, remember and treasure it up; no, nor keep himself in a criminal and treacherous retirement, as you so often do. There is, indeed, a retirement just and beneficial to the state, such as you, the bulk of my countrymen, innocently enjoy: that, however, is not the retirement of Æschines; far from it. Withdrawing himself from public life when he pleases—and that is often—he watches for the moment when you are tired of a constant speaker, or when some reverse of fortune has befallen you, or anything untoward has happened (and many are the casualties of human life): at such a crisis he springs up as an orator, rising from his retreat like a wind; in full voice, with words and phrases collected, he rolls them out audibly and breathlessly, to no advantage or good purpose whatsoever, but to the detriment of some or other of his fellow citizens and to the general disgrace.

Yet from this labor and diligence, Æschines, if it proceeded from an honest heart, solicitous for your country's welfare, the fruits should have been rich and noble and profitable to all—alliances of states, supplies of money, conveniences of commerce, enactment of useful laws, opposition to our declared enemies. All such things were looked for in former times—and many opportunities did the past afford for a good man and true to show himself—during which time you are nowhere to be found, neither first, second, third, fourth, fifth, nor sixth—not in any rank at all—certainly on no service by which your country was exalted. For what alliance has come to the state by your procurement? What succors, what acquisition of good-will or credit? What embassy or agency is there of yours, by which the reputation of the country has been increased? What concern domestic, Hellenic, or foreign, of which you have had the management, has improved under it? What galleys? what ammunition?

what arsenals? what repair of walls? what cavalry? What in the world are you good for? What assistance in money have you ever given, either to the rich or the poor, out of public spirit or liberality? None. But, good sir, if there is nothing of this, there is at all events zeal and loyalty. Where? when? You infamous fellow! Even at a time when all who ever spoke upon the platform gave something for the public safety, and last Aristonicus gave the sum which he had amassed to retrieve his franchise, you neither came forward nor contributed a mite—not from inability—no! for you have inherited above five talents from Philo, your wife's father, and you had a subscription of two talents from the chairmen of the boards for what you did to cut up the navy law. But, that I may not go from one thing to another and lose sight of the question, I pass this by. That it was not poverty prevented your contributing, already appears; it was, in fact, your anxiety to do nothing against those to whom your political life is subservient. On what occasions, then, do you show your spirit? When do you shine out? When aught is to be spoken against your countrymen!—then it is you are splendid in voice, perfect in memory, an admirable actor, a tragic Theocrines.

You mention the good men of olden times; and you are right so to do. Yet it is hardly fair, O Athenians, that he should get the advantage of that respect which you have for the dead, to compare and contrast me with them—me who am living among you; for what mortal is ignorant that toward the living there exists always more or less of ill-will, whereas the dead are no longer hated even by an enemy? Such being human nature, am I to be tried and judged by the standard of my predecessors? Heaven forbid! It is not just or equitable, Æschines. Let me be compared with you, or any persons you like of your party who are still alive. And consider this—whether it is more honorable and better for the state, that because of the services of a former age, prodigious though they are beyond all power of expression, those of the present generation should be unrequited and spurned, or that all who give proof of their good intentions should have their share of honor and regard from the people. Yet, indeed—if I must say so much—my poli-

tics and principles, if considered fairly, will be found to resemble those of the illustrious ancients, and to have had the same objects in view, while yours resemble those of their calumniators; for it is certain there were persons in those times who ran down the living, and praised people dead and gone, with a malignant purpose like yourself.

You say that I am nothing like the ancients. Are you like them, Æschines? Is your brother, or any of our speakers? I assert that no one is. But pray, my good fellow (that I may give you no other name), try the living with the living and with his competitors, as you would in all cases—poets, dancers, athletes. Philammon did not, because he was inferior to Glaucus of Carystus and some other champions of a bygone age, depart uncrowned from Olympia, but, because he beat all who entered the ring against him, was crowned and proclaimed conqueror. So I ask you to compare me with the orators of the day, with yourself, with any one you like: I yield to none. When the commonwealth was at liberty to choose for her advantage, and patriotism was a matter of emulation, I showed myself a better counselor than any, and every act of state was pursuant to my decrees and laws and negotiations; none of your party was to be seen, unless you had to do the Athenians a mischief. After that lamentable occurrence, when there was a call no longer for advisers, but for persons obedient to command, persons ready to be hired against their country and willing to flatter strangers, then all of you were in occupation, grand people with splendid equipages. I was powerless, I confess, though more attached to my countrymen than you.

Two things, men of Athens, are characteristic of a well-disposed citizen—so may I speak of myself and give the least offense: in authority, his constant aim should be the dignity and preeminence of the commonwealth; in all times and circumstances his spirit should be loyal. This depends upon nature; power and might upon other things. Such a spirit, you will find, I have ever sincerely cherished. Only see. When my person was demanded—when they brought Amphictyonic suits against me—when they menaced—when they promised—when they set these miscreants like wild beasts upon me—never in any way have I abandoned my

affection for you. From the very beginning I chose an honest and straightforward course in politics, to support the honor, the power, the glory of my fatherland, these to exalt, in these to have my being. I do not walk about the market place gay and cheerful because the stranger has prospered, holding out my right hand and congratulating those whom I think will report it yonder, and on any news of our own success shudder and groan and stoop to the earth, like these impious men who rail at Athens, as if in so doing they did not rail at themselves; who look abroad, and if the foreigner thrive by the distresses of Greece, are thankful for it, and say we should keep him so thriving to all time.

Never, O ye gods, may those wishes be confirmed by you! If possible, inspire even in these men a better sense and feeling! But if they are, indeed, incurable, destroy them by themselves; exterminate them on land and sea; and for the rest of us, grant that we may speedily be released from our present fears, and enjoy a lasting deliverance!

MAR 2 5 1940